THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE relations of the Church to the State, which have contributed so much to the fashioning of past history, are in the present age entering a new phase, for the world-wide expansion of the Church and the new sources of influence available to the modern State combine to pose new questions. Some of these are opened up in three lectures recently published—*Cæsar the Beloved Enemy*, by the Rev. M. A. C. WARREN [1]—and we propose to examine the second lecture which deals with the function of the Church in the Social Welfare State.

Before the State took any notice of the Church, the Church was formulating its relation to the State in the Epistle to the Romans. As defined there by St. Paul the function of the Church in this relation is threefold. First, the Church bears witness to its primary loyalty which is to God, and yet at the same time acknowledges that the State has a true authority, not absolute but derived from God. 'There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.' Second, the Church provides a new dynamic for the common life and so indirectly serves the State. The Church as it obeys God finds that it cannot be an exclusive fraternity, but by its very nature as a brotherhood of love must reach out in service to the life of society. No one can doubt but that as the Church fulfils the precepts of the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, overcoming evil with good, it purifies and enhances the life of society and so undergirds the State. Third, the Church respects the true dignity of the State and supports it in its tasks of preserving order and establishing justice. No doubt this can be perverted into making the Church merely a bulwark of things as they are. So to read the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle is to misunderstand it. After long years of turmoil the Roman Empire had established reasonable peace and justice over all the Mediterranean lands. It was obviously true that the ruler of that day, by rescuing society from anarchy, had proved himself 'the minister of God to thee for good.' It was in that context that the Church could call men both to a new way of life and to be subject to the authorities—not simply to endure them but in the fulfilment of God's purposes to co-operate with them in love, for love is 'the fulfilling of the law.' In so far, however, as the State sets itself up as absolute and refuses to approximate to the Divine standards of righteousness, the Church must follow its primary obligation to obey God rather than men.

The situation of the Church to-day in many countries bears a certain similarity to its situation in the first century, and that means both danger and opportunity for the Church. For one thing the State, with modern techniques of mass education and propaganda at its disposal, is vastly more influential than it was before, and it has taken to itself under the guise of social service many responsibilities which used to fall to the family or to voluntary agencies. In this Social Service State with its tendencies to Totalitarianism the Church has become the main guardian of the voluntary principle and the nurse of the true values of democracy. These values must exist in a host of little democracies, like the family and neighbourhood groups, if they are to continue on the larger scale. It will be noted that this is approximately the second function of the Church which seemed to be outlined by St. Paul.

At this point the author whom we have been following suggests that the Church, if it is to stand for these values, must beware of the pressures of centralization which make for the weakening of the smaller cells of the Church's own corporate life. Centralization may seem to make for efficiency, but it will be a sterile efficiency if the deepest values which the Church exists to promote are withered at the circumference.

Another important change in our day is that since the Social Service State deserves that name and does in fact minister to the material needs of the people, it is doing on a large scale and for all what the Church used to do on a small scale for as many as it could. Thus the Church loses one of the obvious ways of demonstrating its faith by its works. Though the Church pioneered much of this social service and created much of the

[1] S.C.M.; 4s. net.

conscience which produced the new idea of the State's functions, the Church for that very reason bulks less in the view of the ordinary man and is pushed farther from the centre of society.

What can the Church do in that situation? It can still exercise a profound influence on the Social Service State—and approximate to the third function mentioned above—if it deliberately fosters the vocation of its people to give their services to God through the social services. It must be insisted that the social services leave untouched many needs which only human understanding and love can meet, and thus a chance of making vital changes in society is open to the Church through the infiltration of individuals and groups, living in the power of a redemption which they have themselves received, and applying their spiritual insights as opportunities present themselves in the contacts of person and person.

The Church to-day as in the days of Nero has to worship God and bear witness to His sovereignty, thus exercising a prophetic ministry toward the world. It has to demonstrate Christian love and so to sweeten and purify the world. It has to honour the State by qualifying men and women truly to serve the State and so to prepare it for its place in the purposes of God. 'To prophesy, to purify and to prepare. Those are still the functions of the Church in the Social Service State as they were in the days of Nero.'

He who is engaged on the task of religious education at this present time has a difficult task, and in *The Pattern of Christian Belief*[1] the Rev. J. W. D. SMITH, D.D., has written a book to help in that task.

The modern teacher is faced with a situation in which 'the acids of modernity,' in Walter Lippmann's vivid phrase, have dissolved a great deal of the traditional pattern of the Bible. Science has impinged on the Bible's science; and even Biblical scholarship itself has resulted from one point of view in a collection of problems of authorship, authenticity, date, and historicity which are bound to affect certainty. Further there is the problem of relevance. 'The scripture teacher must attempt to translate the realities of Christian belief so that they become meaningful and relevant for the modern mind.' To help to face these problems Dr. SMITH has worked out in the Bible a pattern which he calls 'The Drama of Salvation.'

[1] Nelson; 12s. 6d. net.

That pattern consists of The Prologue, An Overture, Five Acts, and an Epilogue. In the Prologue—Gn 1–11—the human situation is set before us. We see the purpose of God in creation; and we see that essential selfishness and disobedience which is the source of discord in man's nature and strife in human society. In the Overture—Gn 12–50—in the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and Joseph the main themes of the Biblical drama are stated. These main themes are quite simply God speaking to men, and men responding either in obedience or disobedience. Act one of the drama is the call of Israel, a call which becomes specially dramatic in the events of the Exodus and the Covenant at Sinai. The drama is already a drama of deliverance and of call to obedient service. Act two is the story of the broken covenant. It is a story of failure and disaster. It is a story of Israel's infidelity to her covenant privileges and obligations; and therefore it is also the story of the frustration of God's purposes for mankind. Act three is the unfolding of the undying hope. Even in the Exile the tremendous optimism of the prophets never doubts a new deliverance; and even in the troubled days after the return the prophets still dream of a new day and of the Rule of God. Act four is the coming of the Messiah. Contemporary Messianic hopes were concerned only with dreaming of the removal of the symptoms of the trouble. Jesus sought to cure the disease itself. He was rejected and forsaken. His resurrection proved and guaranteed His Messiahship. And once He was accepted for what He was the way was opened for the coming of the Spirit and the birth of the Christian Church. Act five deals with the way of salvation. The way of salvation is proclaimed in Christian preaching, and thought out in Christian theology; and is contained in the story of the Church, through failure and through triumph to this present day. Finally there is the Epilogue which is contained in the *Revelation*, and which sees in Christian experience a foretaste and also a guarantee of the final defeat of evil and the ultimate triumph of God.

Here, then, is the pattern of Dr. SMITH's book. But Dr. SMITH has something of the greatest interest to say, not only about the pattern as a whole, but about each part of it. And in this detailed application and exposition of the pattern Dr. SMITH touches nothing which he does not illuminate.

Let us take the case of Abraham. Clearly Abraham is a most significant figure in that pattern. Now in this case Dr. SMITH uses the

best form of typology, in which he makes use of all the best in that dangerous way of approach, and avoids all the worst.

Abraham is the great type of the man who has responded in trust and obedience to the initiative of God. Abraham is the type of the *prophet*. He looked for a city whose builder and maker is God (He $11^{8.10}$). 'Like all the great prophets of Israel, in common with the whole prophetic tradition in Israel's religion, he looks for the coming of the perfect city of God.' Abraham is the type of our *common humanity*. He is aware of 'unsatisfied desire and unfulfilled aspiration.' This is a universal, although for most men a spasmodic, realization. 'Thrust out from the womb of nature, finite and mortal man can find no enduring home in the world of time and sense.' 'He cannot truly understand himself and his world except from a standpoint which lies outside of both.' Man is restless until he finds rest in God. He is the type of our *Christian faith*. He recognizes his inner restlessness, and he also recognizes the only cure. The cure lies in trust and obedience to the Word which comes from God, in 'accepting that utter dependence on God which men are normally so unwilling to acknowledge.' Here, indeed, is illumination.

And the complete fulfilment of this acceptance of God is in Jesus Himself. He repudiates all self-centred hopes. 'At last an Israelite had appeared who was ready to commit himself in perfect trust and obedience to the purposes of God. A new and decisive act had begun in the drama of salvation.'

Here is a book about the Bible which will make the Bible a much richer and a much more coherent book. This book does not impose a pattern on the Bible; it finds a pattern in the Bible. For many a teacher this book will be a new revelation.

The New Testament Doctrine of the Hereafter: Universalism or Conditional Immortality

By the Reverend R. J. H. Shutt, M.A., Ph.D., Chaplain, The University of Exeter

The Biblical view of man is characterized by its insistence on human sin, whereby man is separated from God. The theme of the Bible, as a whole, is the story of Redemption and the victory over sin. God's saving work, however, being carried out on behalf of human beings, seeks their willing co-operation. Where that is forthcoming, the possibility of salvation is opened up. But supposing such willing co-operation is not immediately forthcoming, and even deliberately withheld? What then? This supposition, which is not by any means merely hypothetical, raises large issues. Restoration, or restitution, are key Bible words in this connexion. The idea of restitution is to be found in the Old Testament, and the New Testament speaks of 'the times of restoration of all things' (Ac 3^{21} R.V.) in connexion with the Ascended Christ.

The insistent question is, 'Will all men be saved hereafter?'

Our Lord's Teaching in the Gospels

Jesus is reported as speaking of 'eternal punishment' (Mt 25^{46}) in a passage on the Last Judgment, and the separation of the nations as sheep and goats: it is in antithesis to 'eternal life.'[1] The adjective is here the same for punishment and life, namely *aeonios*. In the New Testament this word does not have an exclusively temporal connotation, for, in the use of *aion* there is a distinction between the present *aion*, and that which is to come, so that while the temporal aspect exists, there is also the ethical.[2] Eternity therefore is not simply unending duration, merely quantitative; it is also qualitative, because it is connected with Christ. The use of these particular phrases, 'eternal punishment' and 'eternal life' are not in themselves therefore decisive.

The blasphemer against the Holy Ghost 'hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin' (Mk 3^{29}). The Western Text omits 'for ever,' and St. Matthew says 'it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come,' thus giving greater emphasis to our Lord's words. Here, therefore, it is plain that the Gospel texts do not show complete unanimity as to the permanency of the guilt of the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost, while agreeing that such blasphemy

[1] Cf. Jn 5^{29}.

[2] See article 'Time' in *Theological Word Book of the Bible*, ed. Richardson.

renders the offender guilty of 'essential wickedness.'[1] St. John (8[24]) speaks of those who 'die in their sins,' without stating whether such sins and guilt will remain eternally.

In the sayings given in Mk 9[41-50], it is recorded that it is better to enter into life with one hand or foot or eye rather than to be cast into hell, 'where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,' with one's limbs intact. Here it is to be noted that this phrase occurs in the best ancient authorities once only (*v.* 48), in others it is repeated at *vv.* 44 and 46. The supreme emphasis is on the thrice-mentioned importance of entering into life; it is by no means clear that the vivid language and metaphor here used are intended to give detailed information about the fate of the lost. The fate of the lost is here described as 'hell,' and it is to be distinguished from other meanings of hell, as, for example, that of Hades, or the place of departed spirits.

The 'weeping and gnashing of teeth' recorded in Mt 24[51] echoes the same line of thought. The fact of separation from God, with attendant pain and sorrow, is emphasized, and the word 'there' describes the place where, or the circumstances in which, such gnashing of teeth will take place, but there is no definite statement about its duration.[2]

The Parable of Dives and Lazarus (Lk 16[19-31]) must be referred to in this connexion. In this Parable, Abraham reminds Dives that there is 'a great gulf fixed' between Dives and Lazarus, which cannot be bridged: Dives is tormented after death, while Lazarus is comforted. It is easy and tempting sometimes to read too much into such a statement. Tertullian argues from it,[3] for example, that the soul is corporeal. It is, says Dr. Plummer,[4] 'a grave error to suppose that the scene in Hades is the only part of the parable that is significant, or that its purpose is to teach us the nature of the unseen world. The one thing that it teaches us is that our condition there depends upon our conduct here. . . .' In any case, if the interpretation be pressed to include detailed teaching about the life hereafter, there is surely the inconsistency, not to say absurdity, of thus interpreting, on the one hand, a great gulf fixed, and on the other hand, Abraham addressing Dives across that impenetrable gulf.

Our Lord's Teaching—Conclusion

Taking all these statements in the Gospels together, we may conclude that there is no passage in which all the Gospels unequivocally state the fact of eternal punishment without any qualification in the meaning or use of the word. In fact, there could even be said to exist a certain reticence in the Gospels on this subject, which is consistent with the general attitude of Jesus to requests for details about the future life. In one hypothetical case,[5] He was content to affirm that God is a God of the living, refusing to be drawn into consideration of minutiae which were in His view of secondary importance, by comparison. For His teaching the positive principle of the living God was sufficient in a question concerning life and death: in questions concerned with reward and punishment, He was content to assert the principles of the heinousness of sin and the goodness of God.

How we live our lives here certainly affects us hereafter, according to the teaching of Jesus, but the Gospels do not state that all human destiny hereafter is decided absolutely and finally by the quality of life here. The statement of Jesus in Jn 12[32] is important in this connexion. 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.' The judgment of this world takes place, and the redemption of mankind is to be complete. Meanwhile, the gate is narrow which leads to life, 'and few there be that find it': many enter in by the wide gate and broad way which leads to destruction (Mt 7[13f.]). In Lk 13[23ff.] similar teaching is found in answer to the question, 'Lord, are there few that be saved?' The question is not answered with a yes or no, perhaps because it is too specific, but the warning is given, 'many . . . shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able.' Later comes the statement 'there are last which shall be first, and there are first which shall be last' (*v.* 30).

The Teaching of the New Testament, excluding the Gospels

It is stated in Ro 11[32] that 'God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all,' and in 1 Co 15[22] 'For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Similarly in Ro 5[19], 'for as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.'

There is no specific reference in any of these passages to the final salvation of every individual; 'all' is used collectively. St. Paul's theme in Ro 11[32] is 'all the classes into which the world may be divided, Jew and Gentile alike, will be admitted into the Messianic Kingdom or God's Church.'[6] The final conversion of Israel is part

[1] See Rawlinson, *St. Mark*, 45.
[2] Cf. Lk 12[46].
[3] *De Anima*, viii.
[4] In *HDB* iii. 88.
[5] Mt 22[32].
[6] Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* [ICC], *ad. loc.*

of the Christian hope (Ro $11^{25f.}$). Père Prat ascribes to 'dogmatic prejudices' [1] the refusal to believe in the final conversion of the Jews, in the face of this statement, and instances Luther's view that the Jews, being harder than the devil, were incapable of conversion. It is, indeed, for the most part, now agreed that St. Paul has in mind in these passages the Jews as a people, so that 'all' is used collectively, rather than particularly of each individual. Nevertheless, too fine a distinction should not be drawn between the individual and collective uses of 'all.' The collective use of the word presumably includes the individuals which it comprises. If the final salvation of every individual is not specifically stated in these passages, it is likewise not denied, either specifically or by implication.

The Pastoral Epistles contain three relevant passages: God 'who willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth' (1 Ti 2^4); '. . . because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe' (1 Ti 4^{10}); 'For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men' (Tit 2^{11}). So, too, the mystery of God's will includes the summing up of 'all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth' (Eph 1^{10}). Also, 'it was the good pleasure of the Father . . . through Jesus to reconcile all things to himself, . . . whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens' (Col $1^{19.\ 20}$). In the reference to the subjection of all to Christ, 'that God may be all in all,' 'all' may be taken collectively, or more exclusively as all who are in Christ. In these passages God's will is described, and, in effect, the appeal of those Epistles is for men to co-operate with the Divine will. Whether men will do so, and when, are questions which are not there treated, except by implication. It is clearly held that the realization of God's will concerning man is conditioned by man's response to God.

The Revelation of St. John the Divine is more explicit. The 'devil that deceived them' and the beast and the false prophets are 'cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, . . . and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever' (Rev 20^{10}). God is indeed vindicated.

That sketch is necessarily brief, but it includes, I hope, representative and relevant passages on this subject. What, then, of their interpretation? Throughout all this, man's essential nature and the terrible nature of sin are recognized, and the awful potentialities of man's abuse of his will emerge clearly.

There are two main interpretations: (1) The doctrine of conditional immortality, which insists that because Christ is the source of all life, rejection of Him must involve, as a consequence, annihilation. If we are to achieve immortality, we must obey the conditions; otherwise, we shall not enjoy its benefits. (2) The doctrine known as universalism or restorationism, which insists that all will ultimately become reconciled with God.

The doctrine of degrees of salvation is also propounded. This is the view, if Bicknell may be quoted 'that through suffering after death men will be brought to repentance, but that the consequences of their past will remain.' It is, therefore, asserted that repentance is possible even for the apparently hardened sinner, so that this view in this respect is consistent with universalism.

The Doctrine of Conditional Immortality

Only by grace in Christ, it says, are men immortal: such grace is withheld from impenitent sinners, who thereby will be annihilated. Arnobius the earliest exponent of this doctrine as such (A.D. 300) considered the human soul so full of imperfection and sin. Such a soul, he concluded, could not be immortal, except by the special gift of God. Therefore, for unrighteous souls there must remain after death a second death, a Gehenna of unquenchable fire by which they are gradually consumed, and at last extinguished (*Disputationes contra gentes*, ii. 15–54). That is essentially the content of the view to-day. Immortality is indeed conditional. The validity of this view stands or falls on possible annihilation, whatever its merits in other respects. Moreover, in effect this theory rests on the denial that man is immortal: immortality is rather something conferred, which is not implicit in man as he is. It also equates destruction, for which the New Testament uses a variety of words (*ἀπόλλυμι, ἀπώλεια, καταργέω, φθείρω, ὄλεθρος*), with annihilation. It ignores the important New Testament teaching that existence is not the criterion of life: real life consists in a relationship with Christ, and real death is an absence of relationship with Him. Accordingly, it is possible to be alive in one sense and to be dead in the real sense; and to be dead, in the sense of having departed from this world, and yet to be really alive. Existence, according to the doctrine of conditional immortality, seems to be thought of for the most part as quantitative, to be continued *ad infinitum* or brought to an end. We always need to bear in mind that eternity, in the New Testament, is not just an endless quantity. The confusion which is to be found in this theory rests on the implication that existence is just such an endless quantity, whereas life is not just existence, and death is not non-existence.

Moreover this view that man can only be

[1] *La Théologie de Saint Paul*, i. 321.

immortal by the special gift of God, through Jesus Christ, has tended to limit the conferring of the gift to a comparatively small number of chosen people who have made their response to God. It lends itself to the more extreme forms of predestination.

Conditional immortality forces us back to the Christian doctrine of man, for it would appear according to that theory that if man can only be immortal through the special gift of God, then such immortality is not implicit essentially in man. But how does that fit in with the view that man was made in the image of God? For, if such is his essential nature, that image of God could be said to imply immortality. True, man is a fallen creature, and the results of man's sin are widespread and terrible, and as a result man may deserve to lose his claim to immortality. To say that, however, is different from assuming with the supporters of conditional immortality that all men have lost it or will lose it, only to regain it by God's special gift.

The Doctrine of Universalism

At worst this is an easy-going answer to the problems and anxieties of the human race, inasmuch as it insists that all men will ultimately be reconciled with their God. Sometimes, admittedly, it is prompted by sentimental goodwill, and finds solace in the comforting thought that we need not concern ourselves overmuch, because it will all turn out all right in the end. But no view is to be judged by the defects of some of its less profound exponents, even when universalism degenerates into the dreamland, the enchanted land of theology, 'the cloudland looming with rose-tinted peaks in the far aeonian future.' [1]

It finds more worthy exponents in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and especially Gregory of Nyssa. It emphasizes the possibility for all of restoration to fellowship with their Maker, and the abolition of evil; it does not reject the possibility of punishment, but asserts that its purpose is not properly punitive but remedial, so that God may be 'all in all,' and His ultimate almighty purpose in creation be not frustrated but achieved.

We are brought face to face with the question, 'Is the death of final separation from God a real possibility?' The answer to it depends not on mere sentimental humanitarianism, of which there is often ample supply in the world to-day, but on the sufficiency of the Atonement. If the Cross is 'a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,' we cannot deny to any one the real possibility of salvation, especially when we are trying to think in terms of eternity. The really ultimate purpose of God is victory, or the redemption of creation. It is no real objection to universalism to say that God's righteousness may be vindicated in condemnation, for God's love, as the Atonement shows, seeks a positive result: mere condemnation as the final result is insufficient, and inconsistent with Him.

Now, if we go back in thought to the Scriptural passages which we considered, it is undeniable that passages in St. Paul (in Romans and Galatians especially) are capable of universalistic interpretation, for example, 'as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive' (1 Co 15^{22}) and 'as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous' (Ro 5^{19}). Considered from the point of view of the Atonement, universalism is implicit, not to say explicit in the New Testament. Yet, as we saw, the New Testament also warns us that men may reject the universal gospel which Jesus brought. Considered from the point of view of man, as long as man has free-will, such a grim possibility remains ('Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven'). But to set the will of a finite sinful creature over against the infinite will of his loving Creator as shown in the Cross, and to declare that some will reject God in eternity, *that* seems to me in itself to belittle God's almighty power. Granted the possibility of rejection; but to go on from that to the assertion that God will be so rejected seems to me a conclusion which is not justified. Man, fallen creature though he is, is yet perfectible: that seems to be the assumption behind the Incarnation. Should it be objected that to say that no soul will finally be lost denies man's freedom, it may be answered that to assert that any soul will finally be lost denies God's love and power. In any case a finite will of a creature cannot be quite so potent through eternity as the infinite will of the Creator.

Vivid prognostications of the future in time may be attractive and tempting, but such a practice is to be deprecated with regard to eternity. Conditional immortality contains the truth that it is a real possibility that God's antecedent purpose for man may be frustrated; that is different from asserting that it *will* be frustrated. Universalism contains the truth that it is a real possibility that God's antecedent purpose for man may be achieved; that is different from asserting that it *will* be achieved. But whereas the former results in despair and defeat, the latter results in hope and victory. 'We are saved through hope.'

Herein we are again recalled to a consideration of God's nature and revelation. Archdeacon Farrar's book on Christian Hope surely intended this, but his view, expressed in the title of that

[1] *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1878, p. 135.

book, was criticized as vague sentiment which refused to accept the logic of his convictions. 'The argument,' said Dr. Hall,[1] 'is indeterminate in conclusion and betrays conflict between his heart and his intellect.'

It can again legitimately be remarked that hope in the New Testament is not presented as sheer make-believe or wishful thinking. As Dr. Salmond expressed it in his *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality* (p. 469): 'What is the end of God's ways with human lives? When the veil between the visible world and the invisible is rent by death, what opens for the individual? . . . If there is a life of permanent grace and blessedness for the righteous, is there also a life of continuous retribution for the unrighteous? . . . Is there in any of the aeons of an unmeasured Hereafter a spot bright with the prospect of the triumph of Love over all perverse wills? Or are the retributive processes which we see in operation here to follow men into the other world and work themselves out there, so that for some the issue may be a continued choice of moral evil, bringing with it the blackness of darkness for ever?'

'A spot bright with the prospect of the triumph of love' is preferable to the 'blackness of darkness for ever.' Such a view is supported by investigation of the relevant New Testament passages, and refers the whole issue to that Hope upon which all the New Testament teaching on the Hereafter depends.

[1] *Dogmatic Theology*, x. 227.

Literature

EXISTENTIALIST THEOLOGY

WHAT is the nature of human existence? What does it mean to be a human being? According to the Existentialists the primary task of philosophy is to analyse and describe what is involved in our awareness of ourselves as existing. That we exist requires no proof, but the nature of our existence needs to be explored.

We are aware of ourselves as persons. We know that we are not things, nor are we just like other animals. What is the nature of these differences? Self-consciousness is that which sets us apart from the rest of creation. Along with it, and part of it goes our sense of freedom and of responsibility for our lives. Each one of us may have and should have a life of one's own. Yet the possibilities of human existence are not unlimited. We are aware of ourselves as existing in an external world which both helps and hinders us in realizing our possibilities. Like our own existence as persons, the reality of the external world is a datum, which needs no proof. Kant, indeed, thought it a scandal to philosophy that there was lacking a cogent proof for the reality of a world outside ourselves. Heidegger, the Existentialist, whose philosophy is the subject of Dr. John Macquarrie's admirable study—*An Existentialist Theology* (S.C.M.; 18s. net)—replies 'that the true scandal of philosophy is not that such a proof is lacking but that it was ever looked for.' A similar criticism would apply to Descartes. The famous *Cogito ergo sum* may or may not be logically cogent. It is certainly a superfluity. Our awareness of ourselves as persons does not need any such proof and is not strengthened by it.

As an introduction to the main features of Heidegger's analysis of human existence and existential knowledge Dr. Macquarrie's book can hardly be bettered. And Heidegger deserves closer attention than his work has yet received in this country. His existential analysis may prove to be more fruitful for philosophic understanding of our human situation than the logical analysis whose vogue among British philosophers is not yet exhausted. In any case, Dr. Macquarrie follows Rudolph Bultmann in recognizing the affinity between Existentialism and Biblical theology. The knowledge of God offered to us in the Bible is existential knowledge, the kind of knowledge that friends have of one another. The Bible offers no philosophic proofs of the existence of God. It is concerned with ourselves as existing in some relation or other to God, either as alienated from God or as reconciled to Him. Bultmann's exposition of New Testament theology is directed and inspired in no small degree by Heidegger's Existentialism. Dr. Macquarrie traces the influence of Heidegger on Bultmann in detail, and concludes that particularly for the understanding of St. Paul, Bultmann's reliance on the analysis of Heidegger has proved illuminating.

According to Heidegger, human existence may be authentic or inauthentic. Existence is authentic when we effectively shape our own lives. Wordsworth's Happy Warrior—

> the generous Spirit, who, when brought
> Among the tasks of real life, hath wrought
> Upon the plan that pleased his boyish thought—

had an authentic existence. Our existence becomes inauthentic when we surrender to what H. G. Wells

called ' Everydayishness,' or when with Emerson we find that

> Things are in the saddle,
> And ride mankind.

This distinction sets the theme for the two main parts of Dr. Macquarrie's combined exposition of Heidegger's philosophy and Bultmann's theology. Part one deals with existence as inauthentic and fallen, and part two with the Christian life as authentic existence. Heidegger dominates part one and Bultmann part two, but throughout his sympathetic though critical appreciation of the philosophy of the former and the theology of the latter, Dr. Macquarrie outlines his own conception of an existentialist theology. The book may be warmly commended to all who are seriously concerned with the relations of philosophy and Christian theology at the present time.

H. G. Wood

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

When Dr. Howard retired from the Principalship of Handsworth College in 1951 his friends eagerly anticipated that his new leisure would enable him to make many further literary contributions to New Testament scholarship. His death in 1952 deprived us of this privilege. Some small compensation is now offered by the re-issue of his famous book—*The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (Epworth Press ; 16s. net) —which was first published in 1931. The editor is the Rev. C. K. Barrett, who has already distinguished himself as an expert of the highest rank by his recent commentary on this Gospel.

The opening words in the reviser's Preface will find an echo in the hearts of all who knew Dr. Howard : ' He was to me an ideal of the Christian scholar and Christian gentleman.' In the spirit of that tribute Mr. Barrett has not introduced changes into the pages which Dr. Howard wrote, contenting himself with adding two supplementary chapters to bridge the gap between 1931 and 1955. There is also added in an appendix a careful essay on ' The Common Authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles.' Dr. Howard wrote this in 1947 in reply to Professor C. H. Dodd's arguments in favour of a separate authorship.

In the first of the added chapters we learn that recently discovered papyri now make it impossible to date the Gospel later than the very early years of the second century at the latest. Alexandria as well as Antioch must now be regarded as a possible rival to Ephesus as the provenance of the Gospel. The old endeavours at internal re-arrangements are now being generally abandoned, as it is argued that the author ' was not a historian . . . but a theologian,' and ' the book makes very good sense as it stands.' The former assumption that the Evangelist was acquainted with some or all of the Synoptic Gospels is being increasingly questioned since Gardner-Smith's forthright criticism of this position. The Gospel's close relationship to Gnosticism is widely admitted, but no agreed explanation of it has been reached.

In his second chapter, on recent interpretations of the Gospel, Mr. Barrett limits himself to the methods adopted by Hoskyns, Bultmann, and Dodd. Hoskyns expounds the Gospel as though it lay wholly within the Biblical tradition. In complete contrast Bultmann argues that it is fundamentally a non-Biblical writing which has been adapted to its Biblical environment. Dodd sees it rather as (in W. Oehler's words) a ' piece of missionary propaganda,' a presentation of the original Christian message in terms that would be understood in the Hellenistic world.

For more than twenty years Dr. Howard's book has been an indispensable tool for students of the Fourth Gospel, since it reviews and assesses every major book which had been written about it up to 1931. Mr. Barrett's supplementary chapters bring the book right up to date, and make it as valuable for the student in 1955 as its predecessor was in 1931.

C. Leslie Mitton

NEW TESTAMENT WORDS

The study of words, as Trench demonstrated many years ago in a book with that title, can be most instructive as well as most interesting. Some individual words epitomize concisely what takes much space and time fully to explicate. That happens within any language. Trouble really starts, however, when translation is made from one language to another. We all know that there are French or German words for which no exact one-word reproduction in English is possible and *vice versa*. The difficulty is increased in the case of translating an ancient tongue into a modern.

In the Bible are many words both in Hebrew and in Greek on which the task of the translator is far from complete. That is one reason why an absolutely final version of the Scriptures in English has not yet been found. We all know something of the extent to which this is due to the change of meaning in some of our English words since 1611. But another factor is new light on the meaning of Greek words in the period when the New Testament was written—light which has come mainly from the discovery of *papyri* which represent the Greek of popular usage.

The Rev. William Barclay, B.D., of Glasgow University, needs no introduction to our readers.

We all know the productivity of his fertile mind and busy pen. He is almost a prodigy of scholarly diligence. His latest gift to us is *A New Testament Wordbook* (S.C.M. ; 7s. 6d. net). Readers of ' The British Weekly ' know the series of articles on this subject that he has contributed over a considerable period to that journal. In response to numerous requests from an extraordinary variety of places and from people in many walks of life—from ministers and schoolmasters and Sunday School teachers and solicitors and dear old ladies—Mr. Shaun Herron persuaded Mr. Barclay to put into book form a selection of these articles. So here we have thirty-seven of them.

For this sort of task a writer must be well equipped with knowledge of the Greek language as it was in the Classical and Hellenistic periods and as it was in the mouths of ordinary people of the New Testament age, as is revealed by the recent availability of a mass of contemporary papyri fragments. Further, the writer must be a teacher who can put his knowledge across to the popular mind of his own people. Such qualifications in full measure are the happy possession of Mr. Barclay. In a review of a work of this kind one cannot go through the book in detail nor even catalogue the thirty-seven words with which Mr. Barclay deals. An example or two must suffice. Discussing *apechein* the author remarks on Mk 14[41] ' The phrase which is translated " it is enough " is the one Greek word *apechei*. And it may well mean not " it is enough," but it may be a reference to Judas. Jesus may have pointed to him and said " he has been paid his money in full, the traitor is here." Jesus may well have been saying to Judas : " Is this the payment in full which you have been looking for ? " And so Jesus may have been trying to remind Judas that there was an account with Himself and with God still to be settled.' Well, that sets us thinking. At any rate, *apechein* cannot be made out to mean ' it is enough.' It always refers to payment in full.

Then *eritheia*. It is a word which degenerated in meaning. It has nothing to do with *eris* which means ' strife.' *Erithos* was originally a spinner or weaver, and *eritheia* was a perfectly respectable word meaning ' labour for wages.' Then it sank to signify work done for motives of pay and nothing else, work which has only one question, What can I get out of it ? It went on to mean ' canvassing and intriguing for public office.' Then it came to mean ' intriguing for place and power,' and ended up by meaning ' selfish ambition.' Mr. Barclay reminds us ' most of our troubles to-day are not basically economic troubles, they spring rather from the spirit which asks, always, What can I get out of life ? and, never, ' What can I put into life ? '

These are only examples, and perhaps not the best that might have been selected, of the kind of illustrations with which the book is full. It will supply the preacher with many telling points and perhaps some excellent children's addresses. For a far wider audience it will cast new and most interesting light on many texts of the New Testament.

W. D. Niven

CHRISTIAN CLASSICS ONCE MORE

Volumes of the Library of Christian Classics continue to appear with commendable regularity, the two most recently added bringing the number to twelve, mostly from the early centuries, but several from mediæval and reformation periods. The Rev. Dr. William Telfer of Cambridge is responsible for the new volume entitled *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* (S.C.M. ; 30s. net). From the Works of the former writer we are given the ' Procatechesis ' and eleven of the ' Catechetical Lectures.' A full general Introduction summarizes Cyril's career, gives an account of the Martyry where the instruction was given, describes the practice of catechizing, and claims that we have here ' a venerable teaching tradition, that of the Church of Aelia-Jerusalem.' This most interesting popular summary of doctrine is amply annotated by the editor. The larger part of the volume is taken up with the treatise ' On the Nature of Man ' by Nemesius, with a short introduction and full notes and commentary. It is, of course, important to have a definitive edition of this little-known work in English, but it is surprising to find it in a Library of ' the most indispensable Christian treatises.' It is somewhat of an expert's edition for experts and certainly, for those who know the period in which it seems to have appeared, a valuable self-revelation of the School of Antioch.

The companion volume now issued belongs to quite a different category. Its title is *Luther : Letters of Spiritual Counsel* (S.C.M. ; 30s. net), the editor and translator being Professor Theodore G. Tappert of Philadelphia. This is a popular selection from the immense range of Luther's *Letters* and *Table Talk*, dated from 1516 to 1545, arranged under headings according to subjects, and including messages addressed to sick, bereaved, anxious, perplexed, the troubled, the needy, those suffering persecution, persons worried by sex problems, clergy and rulers. Some of the *Letters* have not appeared before in English. Like other voluminous writers Luther is unfortunately known in English-speaking countries from but a small number of his Works. This is quite serious from the point of view of real understanding of such a broad

mind, and no better approach to a remedy could be found than the introduction of readers to some of the *Letters*. They exhibit the man himself as nothing else from his pen can do, and even the comparatively small number chosen for this collection reveal not only the spiritual counsellor but something of the theological teacher and much of the man of outspoken opinion. One of his main concerns was obviously: 'How the Devil is at work.' The editor gives the historical setting of each document, and the references to the Weimar Edition may induce some for whom this is a first teaspoonful to turn to a study of the *Letters* on a wider scale.

G. D. HENDERSON

SAINT DUNSTAN

Dunstan (909–988) lived an adventurous half-century in rugged times, and was then in quick succession made Bishop of Worcester, Bishop of London, and Archbishop of Canterbury. As a youth, jealous fellow-courtiers had tossed him into a cesspool; he crawled out of it to a hermit's life in the ruins of Glastonbury. In 946 he was made its Abbot and restorer by King Edmund not long before he was murdered. Edmund's son, crowned at the age of fifteen, disappeared from the Coronation banquet. It was Dunstan who found him, crown off, playing with his sweetheart. He planted the crown on the youth's head again, seized him bodily, and dragged him back to his place. Not surprisingly, the Abbot soon afterwards was exiled, but, happily for England, he went to Flanders to imbibe the principles of monastic reform and revival long stirring there. This was the treasure which he brought back to adorn the highest offices of the English Church.

So we approach this biography—*Saint Dunstan of Canterbury*, by Eleanor Shipley Duckett (Collins; 21s. net)—expecting a stirring tale. Nor shall we be wholly disappointed, for on occasion Miss Duckett can vividly describe. In the chapter called 'The (*sic*) Regularis Concordia' she gives us an admirable picture of a tenth century Benedictine's daily life and worship. The rite for the Coronation of King Edgar in 973 at Bath Abbey is so set out that TV viewers of the Abbey of Westminster in 1953 will know to thank Dunstan for much that has remained.

On p. 12 I was tripped up by this paradox: 'Religious life was now secular.' On p. 14 I got lost in a sentence of a hundred and twenty words. On p. 53 two paragraphs seem to be transposed, so that having seen the murder of King Edmund, we find ourselves still riding in his company to the feast. The cumbrous statement on p. 92, 'In northern Wiltshire, on the river Avon, the tradition of Malmesbury Abbey, told by William, its chronicler and monk in the twelfth century, held that . . .' really means 'William of Malmesbury (*c.* 1140) said. . . .' Such difficulties of style add confusion to history, at this period confused enough, and slow down a story which should be swift-moving all the way. Geography is often laboured and not always correct. The Clent Hills are far north of the Cotswolds, and the admirable maps on the end-papers are marred by mixing the past (Northumbria, Mercia, etc.) with the present (county names—some faulty) without difference in type. References to sources throughout are all that could be wished.

JOHN FOSTER

SCIENTIFIC AND RELIGIOUS THINKING TO-DAY

An extremely competent general review of the interactions of religious and scientific thought and feeling in the modern world is given by Canon Arthur S. Smethurst in his book, *Modern Science and Christian Beliefs* (Nisbet; 21s. net). It is no disparagement of the rest of the book to say that the last fifty pages, containing four appendices which are really independent essays, are the most valuable, giving, as they do, a succinct yet adequate critical summary of the leading modern movements of thought affecting the theological outlook to-day.

It would be of no service to condense further what is there said so well about Logical Positivism, Dialectic Materialism, Existentialism, and the work of Bultmann and Heim. It is to be noted that Canon Smethurst is very helpful in indicating sympathetically what is of positive value in systems which are to be rejected as a whole. He is perhaps particularly illuminating in his criticism of Bultmann's use of Existentialism to by-pass the difficulty of the mythological element in the New Testament.

The earlier part of the book pleads for understanding and co-operation between Christian thinkers and scientists with the recognition that scientific and Christian conceptions do impinge on one another. He maintains that the assumptions at the basis of all science imply the dogma of Theism and that in historic fact it was the Christian view of the world that opened the door to scientific study. And he shows how the self-criticism of modern science has both undermined its strategic capacity to attack Christian doctrine and tended to show the ultimate results of scientific speculation to be congruous with a religious view of the world.

R. W. STEWART

We are glad to be able to draw attention to an American book which deserves careful study on this side of the Atlantic, too—*Foundation of American Freedom*, by Mr. A. Mervyn Davies (Abingdon Press; $3.50). The author, who has to his credit several books on English and Colonial history in the eighteenth century, has now turned his attention to the moral and spiritual, as well as the political, basis of American freedom. What he gives us in this volume is nothing short of an evaluation of Calvinism's rôle in the development of Western civilization as a whole. What is his test for the presence of Calvinism? 'Where we see efforts being made to transform society into the likeness of a holy community, a Christian commonwealth, and where the chief means employed to that end is a church of convinced believers which shall be free from magisterial interference and democratically constituted—there we see Calvinism at work.'

It may seem strange to some to link up liberty and democracy with an authoritarian like Calvin who did not believe in toleration. Our author, however, makes a strong case which Calvinism's detractors will find it hard to answer.

The style of this book—*Moral Judgment*, by Dr. D. Daiches Raphael (Allen and Unwin; 16s. net)—is on the whole difficult, but frequently reaches brilliant clarity; the subject matter also is by no means easy. The book is divided into two parts—the 'Logic of Morals' and the 'Metaphysics of Morals.' In the first Dr. Raphael sets forth the logical implications of moral concepts and judgments, and arrives at the conclusion that 'fitness' and 'obligation' are the two fundamental moral notions, irreducible to each other. What distinguishes 'obligation' from 'fitness' is that the former assumes personal relationships, and the meaning of this is further elucidated by connecting it with Kant's moral imperatives. Indeed the author is throughout a persistent follower of Kant, although at a distance, and he also shows frequently his indebtedness to Hume.

One of the most valuable chapters in the book takes as its guide the watchwords of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, links these with Kant's teaching, and evaluates the various ethical theories according to the degree in which they carry out—or do not carry out—the requirements of the freedom of the individual, social responsibility, and a democratic rule which does not rule out a certain preference of those who are naturally most fitted to govern. His distinction between a temporary and a permanent selection of such pre-eminent individuals makes his treatment relevant to the present world-situation rendered turbulent by the doctrine of *apartheid*. A careful discussion in the concluding chapter of the perennial controversy between determinism and free-will makes the intriguing suggestion that there need be no opposition. Scientific laws simply assert a regularity of high frequency, and do not include the idea of compulsion, which idea is nothing more than a persisting result of the animistic origin of the notion of cause as revealed by our consciousness of human activity.

During the years when Laud's hand lay heavy upon England fully twenty thousand people left it to go to New England. What was their motive? Formerly it was supposed to be religious; recently it has been held to be economic. An American historian who died in 1946 set himself to end these conjectures and spent ten years in studying the evidence. The fruit of his labours appears in a well-written survey of the period entitled *Charles I. and the Puritan Upheaval*, by Mr. Allen French (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net).

During the same period a still greater number of emigrants went to the southern colonies and the West Indies, and most of them went to better themselves. It is not to be supposed that the economic motive and motives of a political nature were absent as regards New England; but our author's conclusion is that religious conviction was the main motive. This is really a history of England during the period, with a study of the causes of the Great Migration as the dominant interest.

In the series of Reader's Guides published by the National Book League Professor V. A. Demant has produced one on *The Elements of Christianity* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net). After a ten-page introduction he gives a reading list of books under eight headings such as New Testament, Worship, Philosophy, and Ethics, and he has added a short descriptive comment to each book mentioned. The reader in view is 'a reasonably well-educated person who will take as much trouble to understand this subject as any other.' This is a truly useful publication.

Those who wish to know what Christianity is about and what it requires of them should read *The Christian Faith*, by the Rev. D. H. C. Read, B.D. (English Universities Press; 6s. net). It appears in the series of 'The Teach Yourself Books,' and a notable contribution it makes.

Mr. Read, who was till recently Chaplain to the University of Edinburgh, has the enviable faculty,

both in speech and writing, of being able to express the vital Christian doctrines in terms that can be understood by any educated person, even if he or she may lack Church background. We believe that the essential content of the Faith as stated in these eight chapters will be acceptable to almost all Protestant Christians ; and we trust this book will have a wide circulation and come into the hands of many seekers, especially of the younger generation, and of many others who, knowing that they have found, need to be built up in the faith that they may the better be its witnesses.

No Methodist can become a fully accredited Local Preacher in these days unless he follows prescribed courses of study and passes written examinations. There may be loss in this as well as gain, though, in any case, there are fewer racy and original 'characters' about than there were in the old days. To help the 'Preacher on Trial' with his Old Testament studies the Rev. Horace Cleaver, B.D., has written *An Approach to the Old Testament* (Epworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net). The book is well adapted to its purpose. It contains in its two hundred pages twelve 'Studies,' each of which represents a fortnight's work if the course is to be completed in six months. The reader is given what may be described as a history of Israel, suited to the needs of the preacher but without being just edificatory, and based upon selected passages from all the main sections of the Old Testament. Critical questions are treated very simply and within the framework of the history. Each Study is followed by Test Questions which the Local Preacher is required to answer in writing to his tutor. Although the book is intended to serve a specific need it may be warmly commended to laymen who are neither Methodists nor Local Preachers, whether for private study or for use in discussion groups.

As a brief introduction to the subject we know of nothing better than *What is Spiritual Healing?*, by Mr. Douglas Webster, Home Education Secretary of the C.M.S. (Highway Press ; 1s. 6d.). It introduces both the theology and the methods of healing, and if it is shorter than most, it is also cheaper than most and simpler than many.

Why is it that the undeserved suffer ? This is a recurrent problem, and every religious system has to offer a solution. Father E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., discusses the problem in *Providence and Suffering in the Old and New Testaments* (Nelson ; 15s. net). He gives a rapid resumé of the solutions offered by other religions, and then turns to the Bible. He accepts an originally perfect Creation : 'all the works of this one Creator were good,' and by this he means morally good. Freewill provides credit and merit to man for living the good life. Much is made of the idea of corporate personality, and this, interwoven with the concept of vicarious suffering, leads us into the New Testament and to the Death of Christ. The fitting close is the heavenly glory of those who are come out of great tribulation and have washed their robes white in the blood of the Lamb. The treatment is orthodox, and some elements in it will appeal especially to Roman Catholics.

Any minister who has a book-token to spend may be directed to *Pastoral Ministration*, by Professor Paul E. Johnson (Nisbet ; 15s. net).

Let it be said at once that this is a book not only for the minister who goes in for pastoral counselling in a formal way, but for every minister—witness the chapter entitled 'Meeting Death,' with its four sections—Pastoral Care of the Dying, Standing by the Family, The Problem of Grief, The Christian Funeral. Perhaps the most important chapter is that on 'The Pastor Himself.' From the last chapter we take this—'The most constant and insidious danger confronting the pastor in his work is irrelevancy. . . . The disturbing fact, reluctant as we are to admit it, is that we are afraid to love.'

The author, Professor of the Psychology of Religion at Boston University, draws on a varied practical experience, and every reader will agree with the Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, who writes a Foreword, that a debt of gratitude is due not only to him but also to the publishers for making this useful volume available here at a reasonable price.

It is not easy to assess the value of *What Is Man?*, by the Rev. J. Stafford Wright, M.A., Principal of Tyndale Hall (Paternoster Press ; 10s. 6d. net). It aims at being 'A Christian Assessment of the Powers and Functions of Human Personality.' It is well-written and readable. One is rather puzzled alike by its contents and its omissions. We have sections on the Bible, which does not merely *contain* but *is* wholly the Word of God, on miracles, on ghosts and poltergeists. It is not obvious that such topics are here in place. On the other hand, we have scant, if any, treatment of the problem of the individual and society, or of determinism or free-will. Conscience and conversion do not get anything approaching adequate treatment. There are good things in the book ; for example, the exposition of the new

psychology, or the criticism of spiritualism. To each chapter is appended a list of books for further reading.

In this book—*On Authority and Revelation*, by Søren Kierkegaard (Princeton University Press and Cumberlege; 36s. net) —(now translated into English for the first time by Dr. Walter Lowrie) Kierkegaard expresses with characteristic vigour some of his fundamental beliefs. He takes as the background of his discussion the case of Magister Adler, who was deposed for claiming to have a special revelation and who yet did not adhere firmly to his claim. Kierkegaard then proceeds to discuss—rather meanderingly—the relation between authority and revelation and the distinction between a genius and an apostle. After a preliminary lamentation over the reluctance of people in general to 'let the understanding go and take a leap into the religious,' and some sarcastic references to the many authors who deal with premisses and never reach conclusions, he argues that the essential mark of revelation is not its content but the authority which lies behind it. Christianity has suffered repeatedly from attempts to make it plausible, from over-emphasis on the time factor, from the substitution of the history of Christianity for the historic element within it; in short, from unwillingness to become contemporaneous again with the actual coming of Christ into the world. Kierkegaard's distinction between a genius and an apostle exhibits the same tendency, the former acquiring his status by what he is in himself, and the latter by reason of his divine authority. The frequent arresting diatribes against 'geographical' or 'distance' Christianity indicate the spirit of the book and the fundamental religious attitude of its author. If only he did not prefer so frequently to startle rather than convince, and did not revel so excessively in paradox!

We welcome *Protestant Christianity*, by Dr. John Dillenberger and Dr. Claude Welch (Scribners'; 21s. net). It is neither a general statement of Protestant principles, nor a history of the Reformation, nor a history of the Protestant churches, though a large part of it is devoted to a survey of historical developments. The authors who are University teachers, one at Columbia and the other at Yale, have acted on the belief that the nature and meaning of Protestantism can be seen only in the light of its historical development from Luther down to the Christian criticism of society, recent Protestant theology and the ecumenical movement. It is therefore only in the last of their fourteen chapters that they tackle the question, What is Protestantism? This is a book for the scholar, the student, and the intelligent layman; and, considering its size and worth, it is inexpensive.

A book which should be in the library of all branches of the Y.M.C.A. has been issued to mark the centenary of the World's Alliance of that body. It is entitled *History of the World's Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations* (S.P.C.K.; 27s 6d. net). A number of writers are responsible for individual chapters. It makes interesting, even fascinating reading. There were Y.M.C.A.'s in individual existence and doing good work for a long time before 1855, but it was in that year that the World Alliance was instituted. The movement was of English origin, but it had spread to many countries, in some of which its rapid growth was phenomenal. The Alliance had its stormy periods and episodes and was even threatened with disruption which, however, was averted. We have here a full account of its aspirations, its methods, and successes, how its vision was enlarged and what its contribution to the progress of the Kingdom of God has been, how it adapted itself to and faced the problems of a world distracted by two world wars and how it is trying to meet the challenge of the future. It makes an inspiring volume.

Our Freedom, by Miss Minnie Saggers (Stockwell; 10s. 6d. net), consists of nineteen short essays written as a contribution towards the Mission to the Nation in Australia. Dr. F. W. Boreham writes a Foreword, and the essays themselves, most of them Biblically-based and all clearly written, breathe the spirit of faith, and call for consecration and service.

Canon A. E. Swinton has reprinted an article which he wrote for 'The Anglican Catholic' last year, entitled *The Scottish Liturgy*. It is brief, but it incorporates some useful information about the practice of the Episcopal Church in Scotland during the eighteenth century. Copies may be had from the author at Swinton House, Duns, Berwickshire, price 3d.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

V. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition

By the Reverend C. K. Barrett, B.D., The University, Durham

In the Introductory Article [1] in which he indicated the ground to be traversed in the present series, Dr. V. Taylor remarked, with reference to my contribution, 'It seems hard that an author should be expected to be his own critic.' Hard, no doubt, but salutary; and since no one else, so far as I know,[2] has made a detailed examination of the views put forward in the book, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*,[3] I may perhaps be allowed to look at them again.

It is certainly impossible in this article, and would probably be unprofitable, to review again all the synoptic passages bearing in any way upon the Holy Spirit. It will be better to place the question I attempted to raise in the wider context in which alone it can be grasped, and to show its bearing upon the study of the Gospels in somewhat more general terms. When, about fifteen years ago, I began to study the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit, I soon discovered that I must confine my attention to the Synoptic Gospels: Paul, John, and the rest would have to wait for later attention. Further, and more important, it soon became clear to me as I studied the Synoptic Gospels that my own special theme was only part of a much wider problem, that of New Testament eschatology. For the fundamental question which must be faced by any one who would consider the synoptic teaching (or the lack of synoptic teaching) about the Spirit is not whether Jesus could or could not have referred to the Spirit—He was certainly familiar with the Old Testament and therefore also with its teaching about the Spirit of the Lord, which He could easily have reproduced and developed; but whether His general view of the future was such as to leave room for predictions of the coming of the Spirit as well as of the *parousia* of the Son of man.

Those who have read *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, or even the few lines quoted from it by Dr. Taylor in his introductory article, will recall that the conclusion there suggested was that Jesus 'did not prophesy the existence of a Spirit-filled community, because He did not foresee an interval between the period of humiliation and that of complete and final glorification. He did not distinguish between His resurrection and *parousia*, and accordingly there was no room for the intermediate event, Pentecost.' [4] Such (it was suggested) was the expectation; yet in fact upon the Crucifixion there followed not the *parousia* but the appearances of the Risen Christ, which inaugurated a period extending to the present day in which the Church has continued to exist, ever looking forward to the return of Christ in glory, and ever enjoying in the midst of its tribulation the presence and inspiration of the Spirit.

It appears at once that this view of the synoptic eschatology raises acutely problems which at first glance might seem serious enough to subject the argument of the book to such a *reductio ad absurdum* as would immediately invalidate it. The two vital points, on which discerning critics have not been slow to fasten, are these. (1) If this presentation of His eschatological teaching is correct, Jesus was Himself mistaken in His forecast of the future. Undoubtedly this is a serious matter. Modern students of the New Testament are not easily disturbed when it is pointed out that Jesus appears to contradict modern critical conclusions regarding the authorship of the Pentateuch and the Psalter, or the scientific diagnosis of mental disease. He was bound (they will argue) to accept the limited and erroneous beliefs on these subjects proper to a first-century Jew if the Incarnation was not to be a mere sham. Many however will feel that for Jesus to be not merely ignorant (as is professed in Mk 13^{32}) but in error over such a fundamental matter as His own future and the destiny of mankind is a graver difficulty. No one can doubt that an important issue is raised here. (2) If Jesus looked forward to the speedy *parousia* of the Son of man rather than to the continuing existence of a Church, the Church which in fact now exists, and has existed for many centuries, appears to be sundered from its Lord. A continuity which many would hold to be vital to its existence disappears.

It is my aim in this essay to address myself briefly to these questions, with some reference to recent relevant literature.

[1] The Expository Times, lxvi. [September, 1955], 359 ff.

[2] Not even I. W. Batdorf, *The Spirit of God in the Synoptic Gospels* [Princeton, 1952].

[3] 1947; reprinted 1954.

[4] *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 160 (quoted by V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 360 f.).

I

One of the most comprehensive accounts of synoptic eschatology to appear in recent years in English is that of Dr. G. R. Beasley-Murray, in his book, *Jesus and the Future*.[1] The book consists primarily of an examination of the eschatological discourse of Mk 13, but the detailed consideration of the material contained in this chapter inevitably leads the author to study many other passages. With his discussion of the literary theories which have perhaps obstructed rather than facilitated the study of Mk 13 we are not now concerned, and may focus our attention upon two important sections of Dr. Beasley-Murray's book. In ' The Nearness of the End ' (pp. 183–91 ; cf. 260 f.) Dr. Beasley-Murray puts together Mk 9^{1} 13^{30} 14^{62}, Mt 10^{23} and shows that the only meaning they can bear is that the contemporaries of Jesus would not all have died before the *parousia* of the Son of man and the coming of the kingdom of God in power. In this demonstration there is of course nothing strictly new. Already in *The Teaching of Jesus* [2] Dr. T. W. Manson had argued the same case even more trenchantly and concluded that ' Jesus expected the consummation of the kingdom to take place at some time in the immediate future, and that this expectation was not realized.'

We must devote more attention to Dr. Beasley-Murray's next point, ' The Provision for a Period between the Resurrection and the Parousia ' (pp. 191–199). In this chapter he argues that, though the *parousia* is represented by the Gospels as falling within the generation of Jesus Himself, a clear distinction is drawn between the Resurrection and the *parousia*, and that the two are set forth as so far separated in time that much may happen between them. In this interval Dr. Beasley-Murray places the preaching of the gospel to all the nations (Mk 13^{10}), and the prediction that the disciples will (no doubt in the prosecution of their evangelistic task) have to endure suffering. He supports his interpretation by reference to Lk $12^{11f.}$, Mk $10^{38f.}$, Lk $12^{51f.}$, Mt $5^{10f.}$, Lk $12^{4f.}$ 12^{9}, Mk 8^{35}.[3] In this interval also prophecies of the gift of the Spirit might find opportunity of fulfilment, most appropriately that of Mk 13^{11} ; though, indeed, as I have attempted to show,[4] in the earliest form of this saying (Lk 21^{15}) the Holy Spirit is not mentioned.

Dr. Beasley-Murray complains (*loc. cit.*) that ' there are not wanting critics who are prepared to jettison every one of those sayings ' (just mentioned). It may, however, be suggested that, though they should certainly not be jettisoned *en bloc*, they may be patient of a different interpretation from that which he gives them. Mk 13^{10}, for example, may not imply the long process of missionary activity which it naturally suggests to us. The verse should be understood in the light of Dr. J. Jeremias's article ' The Gentile World in the Thought of Jesus.' [5] Curiously, Dr. Jeremias does not refer to this verse, but he deals at length with the analogous saying of Mk 14^{9},[6] and says that ' similar remarks could be made with respect to Mt 24^{14} ' (the parallel to Mk 13^{10}). Dr. Jeremias sums up [7] : ' The gathering of the gentiles . . . is God's powerful eschatological action, the last great revelation of the unbound[ed] grace of God.' This conclusion may not necessarily lead to the view that no time-interval at all is possible, but it does mean that no interest is being directed to the continuing existence of a Spirit-filled community.

The other passages referred to by Dr. Beasley-Murray contain predictions that the followers of Jesus will have to suffer. Here it is necessary to ask : When are the sufferings to take place ? The crucial passage is Mk 8^{34}–9^{1} (from which Dr. Beasley-Murray selects 8^{35}). This follows immediately upon the first explicit prediction of the suffering of the Son of man (8^{31}), and it seems very probable that it should be understood in the light of that prediction. Those who would follow the suffering Son of man must be prepared to suffer with Him—to take up their crosses and be crucified beside Him. (It must not be forgotten that up to the last moment (Mk 14^{31}) Peter protested his intention of dying with Jesus, in the most literal sense.) Men must be prepared for death, and they must not be ashamed to belong to the company of the rejected Messiah ; if these conditions are fulfilled the Son of man will not be ashamed of them when He comes in glory and the Kingdom in power. Mk 10^{39} seems to bear a similar meaning : James and John would drink the bitter cup and share the baptism of death with Jesus. The sufferings of the disciples are co-incident with, not subsequent to, those of Jesus. That some of the sayings in question should have been re-phrased in the light of the solitary death of Jesus on the Cross, and the sufferings of the persecuted and witnessing Church, is no more than might be expected ; but their original sense seems to have been that indicated above.

[1] 1954.

[2] 1935, p. 282. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung* [Basel, 1945], 29–37, ' Die drängende Nähe des Endes.'

[3] All these passages are referred to on p. 194 ; others are mentioned elsewhere.

[4] In *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, 131 f.

[5] *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Bulletin III. [1952], 18–28.

[6] P. 22. Note the illuminating parallel with Rev 14^{6}.

[7] P. 28.

Further arguments for an interval between the death of Jesus and the *parousia* are adduced by Dr. W. G. Kümmel, in his *Verheissung und Erfüllung*.[1] He makes use of the following passages: Mk $2^{18ff.}$ $14^{25.\ 28}$, Mt $23^{38f.}$ (and parallels). On the first I must content myself with the observation that I should prefer to regard the vital words of *v.* 20 as (in their present form) a gloss, arising out of the later practice of Christian fasting. Mk 14^{25} is said to 'presuppose a certain separation between the death of Jesus and the coming of the kingdom of God' (p. 43), as also does 14^{28}, and Mt $23^{38f.}$ presupposes an 'absence' (p. 48; *Fernsein*) of Jesus between His death and *parousia*. The Last Supper sayings (Lk $22^{16.\ 18}$, as well as Mk 14^{25}), however, may well be held to point in the opposite direction. It is quite true that between the meal in the Upper Room and the banquet of the Kingdom there were to intervene the 'messianic woes': and of the company in the Upper Room not one (it appears: see below) knew exactly what would be involved in these woes. But this is not to say that any substantial interval was expected between the 'travail pains of the Messiah' and the birth of the age to come. The Q passage used by Dr. Kümmel is of such doubtful interpretation that I should prefer not to rest an argument upon it alone, or almost alone.[2]

It need not be said that the arguments of Dr. Beasley-Murray and Dr. Kümmel (to mention no others) call for much more detailed treatment than the narrow limits of this essay permit. It is not, moreover, my intention to assert, over against them, that Jesus ever predicted, *expressis verbis*, that the *parousia* would immediately follow His sufferings. It is far more probable that He expressed the confidence that God would vindicate Him without regard to strict consistency. Resurrection and *parousia*, both eschatological terms, were probably both used, in settings, and in a relation to each other, now imperfectly accessible to us. That, for which there seems to be no convincing evidence at all, is the view that any of the disciples was led, by what Jesus had said, to look beyond the Cross to a continuous Church life—even of a few decades duration. Even in the Garden of Gethsemane Jesus urges His disciples to watch (*γρηγορεῖτε*, Mk $14^{34.\ 38}$), meaning not that they were not to go to sleep, but that they should look out for the *parousia*.[3]

Dr. Beasley-Murray's attempt to prove that an interval was expected between resurrection and *parousia* does not solve the problem, of which he himself is very keenly aware, for as soon as it is allowed that the *parousia* was expected within the first Christian generation—whether in A.D. 35 or 65—it must also be allowed that Jesus was mistaken. The discussion of the next point may lead us a little further towards a solution.

II

The plainest consequence of the view of the eschatological convictions sketched above is that Jesus did not foresee the life of the Church, which intervenes between those two events which He did not distinguish. If this be so, is there any sense in which Jesus may be said to have founded the Church? Is it not to be regarded as a religious society which was at most a by-product of His work? Clearly this raises the question what relation exists between the company of disciples who surrounded Jesus during His incarnate ministry, and the Church of the days which followed Pentecost. In *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*[4] the view was expressed that only of the post-Pentecost community could the word 'Church' properly be used; the same persons before the death and resurrection of Jesus and the coming of the Spirit could not be described by the same title. This point was taken up by Dr. T. W. Manson in a review[5] which most readers will judge more profound and stimulating than the book. In it he develops the idea (of which he has written elsewhere) that the life of the Church is a continuation of the messianic ministry of Jesus. 'To be brought into association with Christ in this Ministry is to be brought into the Church; and the Church becomes clearly visible at the moment when Jesus says to the first disciple, "Follow me." From this point of view Pentecost is not the birthday of the Church: it is the Church's coming of age' (p. 200).

I should wish to acknowledge that I have found these suggestions helpful and fruitful. Yet they do not seem to answer the problem completely *in the terms in which it presented itself to me*, namely, in the terms of the eschatological hope of Jesus. As Loisy put it many years ago, '*Jésus a annoncé le royaume de Dieu, et c'est l'Église qui est venue*':

[1] Pp. 38–48, 'Die Erwartung einer Zwischenzeit zwischen Jesu Tod und Parusie.'

[2] O. Cullmann (*Christ and Time*, Eng. tr. [1951], 149 f.), leans heavily upon Kümmel and W. Michaelis (*Der Herr verzieht nicht die Verheissung* [Bern, 1942]), following the latter in stressing the *τινες* of Mk 9^{1}—some will survive, but others will not; a considerable time will therefore elapse. This argument overlooks the importance of Mk $8^{34f.}$: there would be plenty of opportunities of dying in the immediate future.

[3] I hope to return to this incident and to justify my interpretation of it elsewhere.

[4] P. 138 f.

[5] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xlix. [1948], 198–201.

in other words, the ministry of Jesus, including the gathering of disciples, seems to point forward to a vindication and consummation not identical with the emergence of the Church in the form which it bore after the Resurrection.

The answer to the problem (and to some extent it will carry with it an answer to the problem raised in Part I above) will perhaps be found by analysing the announcement of the Kingdom which is to be found in the Gospels. That Jesus did announce the future coming of the Kingdom as an event for which men must watch and pray—'Thy kingdom come'—is almost too clear to call for demonstration: it is the happy alternative to Gehenna (Mk 9^{47}); it will come before the extinction of Jesus' own generation (Mk 9^{1}). Passages which speak of the presence of the Kingdom during the ministry are less common and more ambiguous than is sometimes supposed, yet they do exist, particularly among the parables. The so-called parables of growth draw a contrast between seeds—small, and wasted and mixed with weeds in the sowing—and the crops which spring from them, and thereby draw attention to the contrast between the kingdom of God as it exists, obscure and veiled in its operation, during the ministry, and the Kingdom as it will be when it comes in manifest power. The work of Jesus thus initiates an eschatological process, which itself moves forward through an observable period. We have already seen reason to think that He did not believe that this period would be long; but the essential point lies not so much in its duration as in the contrast between the obscurity of its beginning, with the accompanying suffering which falls upon the Messiah and His followers, and the glory of its consummation.

At this point two observations must be made. In the first place, the suffering in fact did not fall upon the Messiah and His followers, but upon the Messiah alone, His followers proving themselves unworthy to share His lot. In the second place, the suffering and death of Jesus were followed not by the *parousia* but by resurrection appearances, granted not to all men in general but to believers only (cf. Ac 10^{41}, Jn 14^{22}). The effect of this was to make it possible for the disciples to do what at the first opportunity they had proved incapable of doing: they might now become united with Christ in His death. This union could be, and was, expressed sacramentally (Ro 6^{4}; cf. 1 Co 11^{26}), ethically (Ro 6^{11} 8^{13}, Col 3^{5}), and in the experience of suffering (Ro 8^{17}, Col 1^{24}), and by it men could pass with Christ into a resurrection life corresponding in its hiddenness with the incarnate life of Christ. In Him, the majority could see only a Jew, at most a rabbi, at worst a deceiver and political revolutionary; only those who had eyes to see could perceive that the signs of the Kingdom accompanied Him. In the same way, through the work of the Spirit, the Church, poor, ignorant, and persecuted, shows, to those whom the Spirit quickens, those fruits which are the product and sign of Divine life. Thus there comes into being between Jesus and His followers a continuity closer than could have existed if the Crucifixion had been followed immediately by the *parousia*. At the same time, there appears a vindication of His teaching and person more conclusive than if all His predictions had been literally fulfilled.

III

It is time to return to the question which lies behind this article. Why does the synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus contain only a few references to the Holy Spirit, of which none, perhaps, is authentic? No prudent student of the New Testament would commit himself to the statement that Jesus never referred to any given subject. Certainty on such questions is unattainable, and a cautious agnosticism is the wisest course. Yet it may be affirmed as a statement of fact that the Gospel material as a whole concentrates upon two moments in the *Heilsgeschichte*—the moment of humiliation which culminates in the Cross, and the moment of glory which is most completely manifested in the *parousia*. Interest in the intervening period is as a rule demonstrably secondary.[1] It is this focusing of attention upon the end-points of the eschatological process that gives its peculiar intensity to the proclamation of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels, and at the same time accounts for the lack of references to the Spirit.

[1] See N. A. Dahl, 'The Parables of Growth,' in *Studia Theologica*, v. [1951], 132–166. Dahl allows great weight to the idea of growth involved in the seed parables and other material in the Gospels, but concludes: 'No distinction is made in the words of Jesus between an intermediate period of the Church and the coming age of the Kingdom. This distinction emerged as a result of the events of Easter and Pentecost. In this way we understand both the intimate and indissoluble connexion between the eschatology of Jesus and the post-resurrection Church, and also the unexpected character and the revolutionary significance of the appearances of the risen Lord' (p. 166).

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Invisible God

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'The invisible God.'—Col 1[15].

On a fine day recently when the sky was blue and clear there were four aeroplanes—all jets—doing the most complicated manœuvres just over the city where I live. Mark you, I didn't see them. They were much too high up for that. And I couldn't hear them; for all around me was the roar of Glasgow's traffic, of buses and trams and cars. I could neither see the planes nor hear them but I knew that they were there. How, boys and girls? Well, you probably have guessed already. All over the blue sky, like a network of lace, were the lovely white patterns we call vapour trails. We know that wherever there are those sorts of vapour trails, there are aeroplanes. So, although we may not be able to see or hear the aeroplanes, we know that they are there—high up in the skies—by the signs of their presence that they give.

Now there are some foolish people who say that there is no God, just because they can't see Him or hear Him. It is true, as Paul says here, that our God is 'the invisible God', but He has given all sorts of signs of His presence. Look at the perfection of a flower or the beauty of a tree or the glory of the sky and of the sea! Think of the love which has surrounded you since you were a tiny baby! These are the signs of God. God has not left Himself without a witness, the New Testament says, and neither He has. Although we've never seen Him, we know by these signs that He is not far away from any one of us. In Jesus He has come closest of all, for we can see, shining through the words and the life and the death and the rising of Jesus Christ, the glory of the Father, the glory of the Invisible God.

Many Coloured Lights

By the Reverend F. Vernon Moss, B.A., Loughborough

'And there were many lights.'—Ac 20[8].

How many lights are there on a motor-car? The number depends, of course, on the make of car, and how much it cost. Some have more than others. On a little car I know, I counted fourteen lights, a surprisingly large number.

How many different coloured lights are there? To my surprise, I found as many as four—white, amber, red, and green.

What are these many coloured lights for? Here are some of the reasons.

(1) To light up the road ahead on a dark night. The headlamps are most important. We need a light to illumine life's way. 'The light of the world is Jesus.' He said, 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness. . . .' So we are grateful for the light of Jesus—His teaching, example and commandments.

(2) To give warning; these lights are usually red. There are four such at the rear: the brake-lights, which say, 'I am slowing down, beware'; and the parking lights, which say, 'I am here, don't run into me.' Then there are two little red circles on the dashboard which say, 'Switch me off when I have done my task.' We need warnings for life, too. Some of the ten commandments say, 'Thou shalt not . . .' And Jesus sometimes said, 'Beware . . .' You might look up some of these 'bewares' of Jesus.

(3) To give an indication of the driver's intentions. These are the amber traffic arms, the semaphore signals. How grateful we should be to those who, by their lives and service give us wise counsel and sound instruction, kind parents and patient teachers. It is a serious thought, too, that we are often putting out our traffic arms, which indicate to others where we are going, and we may influence them, either for good or ill.

(4) To identify the car's owner. There is a little white light at the rear that illuminates the number-plate by night—that says, 'This is who I am, and I am not ashamed who knows it.' We are identified by our words, and deeds, which say, 'This is the kind of person I am.' Some one said, 'I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.' Of Peter and John it was said, 'They took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus.' Who are we? Have we about us the marks of Jesus?

The source of all the power that lights the lamps is the accumulator. A faulty connexion, a dirty contact, a broken filament, means no light. God is the source of power that lights up our life with goodness, beauty and truth. Our contacts with Him are by our prayers, love, and obedience. So His light shines in us, and through us, as it shone so brightly in the life and death of His Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The Christian Year

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT

The Guerdon of Faith

BY THE VERY REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW

'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'—Mt 15^{28}.

Contemplating the settled malignity meted out by so many to Jesus Christ in the days of His flesh, it is comforting to reckon up the occasions on which men gave Him thrilling surprises of joy. And in most instances it was by some unexpected gesture of faith. There was the Roman officer who declared that Jesus could heal his ailing servant without even coming under his roof. There was the sight of Zaccheus, perched on a tree, risking the sneers of the crowd, that he might have the chance of making a desperately needed friend. There was the amazing interruption of the message of Jesus in a house, by the lowering of a palsied man through the roof that he might win access to His healing powers. But perhaps the crowning example is this of the Syro-Phœnician woman—an utter outsider—who seems to bandy words with Jesus that she might have her daughter's affliction cured—a colloquy that moved Jesus in the end to the exulting words, 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt.' Our subject is the reward of faith. We may learn much by thinking separately of the three parties involved in the incident.

First of all there is *our Lord Himself.* Again and again He told people that there was practically nothing He could not do for them if they would only believe. To be at home in His varied parables is a liberal education in the practice of faith. One outstanding instance is that of the mustard seed—a seed so tiny as to be almost invisible on the palm of the hand, and yet when planted and brought to fruition it became a tree so large that birds lodged in its branches. And what He taught by precept He enforced by example. Consider the utter precariousness of the resources He left behind Him to continue His life-work—an insignificant group of utterly unimportant people against the massed hosts of humanity. Perhaps it is only faith of a calibre like this that will suffice to carry us through the ghastly aftermath of devastating wars. Only such faith can undergird us in a world sick with devastated hopes. Scheme after scheme for peace and goodwill among men seems to reach a measure of fruition and then it crashes to the ground and chaos is come again. But the whole history of man's achievement has always been that of giant faith opposed to long-drawn-out frustration. Those who have exercised it have been the saints of all time and the salt of the earth. Of the merchant adventurers of Elizabeth's day these inspiring words were written—'They dared beyond their strength, hazarded against their judgment and in extremities were of excellent hope.' The saviours of the world to-day are those who go bravely on in the assurance that, despite every evidence to the contrary, this is God's world and His truth and His will shall finally prevail.

> To doubt would be disloyalty,
> To falter would be sin.

The second person involved here was *this woman herself.* Her faith was subjected to an ordeal of endurance that was superhuman. There was the ruthless impatience of the disciples who regarded her as little more than a pest. There was the seeming indifference of Him whom she regarded as her one hope. How He probes at one after another of the foundations of her faith as if He would find some flaw that would bring it crashing to the ground! 'It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs,' said the Master. Instantly came the reply that was born of the passion of maternal love—'Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.' How swiftly, after such a rejoinder, did He put her suspense at an end. 'O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

Life has many calls for us to hold on to breaking point. And when men can do so the relief when it comes is beyond human expression. Many of us can remember from our boyish days reading the episode in Stevenson's *Kidnapped* where David Balfour was marooned on an uninhabited 'island.' For day after day in the wretchedness of the cold and the wet, he waited for rescue, hoping against hope. The last straw seemed to be when he saw a small boat approaching, only to see the sailors mocking his desperate appeals and sailing away in derision. And, then, in the last extremity of his sorrow, he discovers that, at low tide, there is a passage over to the mainland and to safety! How we shared the delirious joy of his deliverance! If this be mere romance, it is a vivid picture of the romance of faith in countless human examples. For the time would fail me to tell of men and women all down the ages who, stretched to the last limit of human endurance, have won through to faith's reward. For our own tests of faith, it were well to keep ourselves in that noble company.

Lastly, involved in this incident were *Christ's disciples.* There was another occasion when they would have forbidden the mothers and their children from invading the privacy of their Master.

But Jesus forbade *them* saying, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.' And here in the story of this aggressively persistent mother they learned another lesson in persevering faith. Little did they think that in the days to come there awaited them many a test in which they also would be tried to the uttermost and the bravery of this unimportant woman would flash back upon them.

Is it not true that there are occasions in life for most of us when our own faith seems to be going out like a guttering candle and we have to borrow the faith of greater and nobler souls than ourselves? We learn to trust their assurance about God more than our own pitiful hesitations. Life seems to shout to us at times 'Trust the experts. *They know.*' Let us try to catch their secret and their song. We can only live the Christian life in its highest fruition when we are in fellowship with the leal and the true and the devout of all generations. In the words of James Denney: 'To be at home in the church is to be delivered from the shallows and miseries of a too narrow experience, and set afloat on the broad stream of Christian conviction that gathers impetus and volume with every generation the saints survive.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT

The Guerdon of Light

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, O.B.E., D.D.,
LONDON

'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'—Jn 8^{12}.

A great claim is followed by a great promise. The promise is in the terms of everyday life. As always in this Gospel profound truth lies beneath the surface of almost every spoken word, but what might be called the surface truth should not be ignored in quest of the deeper meaning. This promise involves no profound thought if it is to be understood and claimed. Theological understanding need not preface the fulfilment of the promise. Walking in darkness—the lot of the countryman in the dark nights of the month. Modern town dwellers came to know something of the terrors of darkness in the time of the 'black-out.' 'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness.' The fear of the hidden obstacle, the wrong turning, the stumbling and bewilderment, these inevitable accompaniments of darkness no longer exist when Christ is Guide.

If the promise, then, is for every man in the ordinary ways of life, it might well be asked, How can it be fulfilled? The answer is—'he that followeth after me.' The promise is of spiritual light but how repeatedly Scripture would have us learn spiritual truth in terms of Nature. All through His ministry our Lord was drawing spiritual lessons from the world of Nature. Almost every object in His world was made to yield its contribution to truth, seed time and harvest, the flowers of the field, the contents of the home—these and other familiar things were for Him ways into the heart of truth. It was as if the world was given to us for two purposes—firstly, to provide the necessities of life and, secondly, to teach us lessons. Perhaps the greatest lesson of all is drawn from light. In the very beginning when all was without form and void light was given and so out of chaos there came order, progress, creative activity. And in the opening verses of this Gospel light, spiritual light, plays its part. How does light come? Light has come in increasing brightness through men discovering more and more of the laws of Nature. They do a number of things which seem to have no relation to light itself. We desire light and a whole world of complicated processes are set to work to give us light. We crave for spiritual light—we do not want to walk through the world in darkness and there comes a promise that if we do something which seems to have no relation to light, then light will be given. Following after Jesus—here is specified a certain kind of living, an emphasis on personal conduct, the Golden Rule, the second mile, doing one's task faithfully, all these matters of daily routine which are seemingly far away from the deeper and higher values of life. But the promise is that the doing of all these things will give light, and doing them we find that we no longer walk in darkness. A great saying comes true once again—'he that doeth the will shall know of the doctrine.' This, then, is the truth which lies on the surface, the obvious lesson, available to every man. Let a man follow after Jesus, doing His will and the way of life will open up, he will no longer walk in darkness. And the more faithfully he follows the clearer will be the light.

The truth in this Gospel does not only lie on the surface, it goes deep down. He that follows Jesus shall have the light of life, he shall have that kind of life which is light. Jn 1^{4} is relevant here—'In him was life: and the life was the light of men.' The promise is in the first place that there will be for those who follow Jesus a guiding light. That simple truth must never be forgotten or overlooked in the search for the deeper meaning. But the deeper meaning is there as the ultimate reward of the life that seeks faithfully to follow in the steps of Jesus. It is not only a light ahead,

like a lighthouse guiding the ship safely through the dark night. It is to become something personal, not only the seeing of a light but in some measure the light is to be in oneself; he shall have 'the light which results from the possession of life.'

The analogy from Nature must not be pressed too far. The ship is guided by the lighthouse but it has something quite separate from that, its own internal guides by which it finds its way. In the spiritual realm the internal and the external are not separate entities. They may begin as such but in the end they merge. Following Jesus is a process. It begins with the injunction that we should follow in His steps. At that stage in our spiritual history the operative word is obedience but as we follow we come nearer to Him. And there are now new words to describe the relationships—companionship, fellowship, communion—until we can dare to speak of the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us. And the promise is fulfilled in the gift of a new kind of life, a new quality which is called in the Gospel 'eternal.' Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor thus expresses it: 'for John the divine life is pre-eminently the life of Jesus; and the gift of Jesus to men is just the secret of His own moral and spiritual personality.' This new quality of life in the individual becomes a light to enlighten others. 'Let your light so shine before men . . .,' and again, 'that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; holding forth the word of life.'

Thus a great promise is fulfilled, stage by stage, revealing life as a wonderful experience, making it worth while, giving to the ordinary everyday routine the high quality of life eternal. But let us never forget how it all begins

Nor name, nor form, nor ritual word,
But simply following thee.

The way to the summit of one of the high hills of our land begins as a small footpath. In itself it seems of little account, to be passed without a second thought. Take the path and it leads on and on, higher and higher, until the summit is reached. Christian life can begin like that, doing something in accordance with His will, finding that one thing leads to another until life more and more is being lived in His Spirit. The Bible comes alive, it is read not only as a duty but because it is the indispensable guide. Life is no longer a dark, confused, at times frustrated, journey but a way that leads to the heights of life eternal. 'The path of the just is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.'

Fourth Sunday in Lent

The Guerdon of Freedom

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., Pinner

'But they cried out, Away with him, away with him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Shall I crucify your King? The chief priests answered, We have no king but Cæsar.'—Jn 19^{15}.

'We have no king but Cæsar.' That, of course, is not what they wanted to answer. In their hearts they hated Cæsar as the symbol of their national enslavement. They merely affirmed a false loyalty to force Pilate's hand. For the moment they hated Christ more than they hated Cæsar and they confessed Cæsar to be rid of Christ. 'We have no king!' That was the true cry of their hearts.

1. Is their situation, seen so clearly by the keen eye of the Fourth Evangelist, singular, either in its essential desire, or in its necessary consequence? Is this not the perennial desire of humanity, the original temptation? 'Ye shall be as gods' whispered the serpent in the beginning; 'we have no king,' said these men confronted by the Christ; 'I don't need God,' says the modern man in his rebellion. Man desires freedom, and he desires his freedom to be absolute. 'No king!' And always by some inevitable law the consequence follows. We cannot deny the higher without affirming the lower. We can only crucify Christ by enthroning Cæsar. Man emancipates himself from the higher world to find himself enslaved to the lower. Man escapes from that slavery only in allegiance to the higher. All human experience is an oscillation between these two possibilities.

(*a*) We live in an age which consciously believes itself to be an age of emancipation. Modern man contrasts himself with medieval man. In the medieval world the Church dominated life, body, mind, and soul, and, in the name of God, set bounds to every human activity from pure thought to geographical exploration. That tyranny could in theory be broken in one or other of two ways. It could be broken by challenging its vision of God; or it could be broken by the denial of God. In historic fact both rebellions proceeded together. The Reformers never sought an absolute emancipation for humanity. They were reformers and not revolutionaries. The revolutionaries were the men of the Renaissance who sought in humanism a substitute for the Church. Their spirit now infects the modern world profoundly.

The men of the Renaissance looked back with longing to a Classical World in which Christ was unknown. The coming of Christ was seen as a

fog, dank and sour, dimming the clear vision, choking the sparkling joy of classical times. They forgot the slavery, the brutality and the despair of the age they idolised.

'We have no king'—'but Cæsar!' The modern world repeats the ancient dilemma. The eighteenth and nineteenth century dream of freedom has become the nightmare of the twentieth century. We have no king—but Mussolini, but Hitler, but Stalin, but Kruschev, but Peron. The allegiance withdrawn from Christ has been given to ignoble men.

(*b*) A special case within that general picture should be given to the scientific studies which are the glory and the terror of our time.

> Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the master of things.

Nowhere else has man's emancipation been so striking. The free and far-ranging mind of man reads, one after the other, the deepest secrets of Nature. 'We have no king.' Surely here is the vindication of absolute freedom.

So it seemed to many thinkers towards the end of the nineteenth century. 'Man is the master of things.' And now his mastery is increased. He is master of rocket propulsion and guided missiles. He is master of atomic explosion and Gamma-ray. He is master of bacteriological warfare and psychological brain-washing.

It is folly to blame science for these things. Science arises within a human situation which it did not create and which it is powerless to break. Cæsar is armed: Cæsar has new powers of devilry: Cæsar is irresistible as never before.

(*c*) The ultimate slavery of modern man is neither political nor scientific but personal. George Bernard Shaw told us, 'The Golden Rule is that there is no golden rule.' But that is a statement of absolute moral freedom which empties human life of all meaning. It is the meaninglessness of existence which prepares the human soil for the bitter harvest of world Totalitarianism and the extinction of the last vestige of personal freedom. This is Kierkegaard's 'Sickness unto death.'

Dr. Paul Tillich in *The Courage to Be* has a most fascinating outline of the spiritual history of mankind. He says man has three fears. The first is the fear of death from which the whole classical age suffered and from which men were delivered by the resurrection of Christ. The second is the fear of guilt or judgment, under which the medieval world suffered, and from which men were delivered by the Reformers' apprehension of our justification through faith in Christ's sacrifice. The third is the fear of meaninglessness, which is the demon possessing the modern world, the despair of modern man. Can Christ save humanity a third time?

2. Is there in Christ a word of emancipation which is spoken especially to the modern world?

(*a*) There is the freedom of Christ. As scribes, Pharisees, Jews, and Romans looked upon Him they beheld the only free man in history. His contemporaries were aware of this without in any sense understanding it. In fact His freedom was at times an offence to them. 'He taught with authority.' 'Who can forgive sins but God only?' 'We never saw it in this wise.' In His handling of men: in His demands upon the natural world: in His relationship to the Scriptures: here was freedom. It seemed in those days to make chaos of the religious and moral order of the world, so they crucified Him. It seems to-day to make chaos of Natural Law, so we reject Him. Both then and now we fear a freedom we do not understand.

For this is the human freedom for which we long and which we can never achieve. This is freedom without rebellion.

How does He Himself describe His freedom? It is freedom to do the Father's will. 'Not my will but thine.' All things, including the Cross, are accepted as the will of the Father. Therefore neither Nature nor man, neither circumstance nor evil spirit, can bind His will. He is free with the freedom of a will at one with the will of God. 'Ye shall be as gods.' He is as God. He is God. History has seen one free man, the man Christ Jesus.

(*b*) There is freedom in Christ. Here is that which alone can fill the vacuum of man's empty, meaningless and despairing existence. Here is the only tyranny which never enslaves.

All these men who stood around at the trial of Christ were slaves—Pilate, Caiaphas, soldiers, mob. Their hearts were filled with hatred, fear, ambition, pride, false hope, false patriotism, false loyalty.

Modern men who stand in judgment over against Christ are slaves. George Orwell's 1984 is in their hearts. When that sombre prophecy was presented on TV recently hundreds of viewers protested. In 1984 TV is in reverse. In every room there is a screen and from that screen the Government watches its slaves. And, in 1984, you can't switch it off. In 1955 hundreds of viewers have already taken that step. They can't switch it off. We are slaves to our entertainment machines, slaves to our industrial machines, and slaves to our war machines. Soon we shall be slaves in space machines asserting man's freedom in the universe.

Freedom is of the spirit and of the will. Freedom is personal. Only in a person whose death is conquered, whose sin is forgiven, whose despair is ended can freedom flower. 'Behold your King.' The Conqueror of death. The Saviour from sin. The Word which transcends the despair of the heart.

PASSION SUNDAY

The Ordeal of Doubt

BY THE REVEREND D. H. C. READ, M.A., B.D., NEW YORK

'Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' Hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.'—Ac $17^{22.\ 23}$.

In the words of the Authorized Version this scarcely sounds a flattering way to address an educated audience. But if we substitute the original Greek word for the Latin we get the original effect: 'Whom therefore ye *agnostically* worship, Him declare I unto you.' Now we can appreciate the tact with which he addressed his academic audience.

The altar which the apostle had noticed among the many dedicated to the various pagan gods was this one with the simple inscription: 'To the unknown God,' 'Agnosto Theo.' This gave him his text. He was not speaking to a materialist, irreligious, insensitive audience. On the contrary —'I perceive,' he said, 'that in all things ye are very religious.' They were people who knew that the meaning of life was not bounded by the things that they could see and measure. But as to the truth behind the surface of life, they didn't know. They were agnostic. So they raised an altar to 'The Unknown God.'

It is a curious fact that our word 'agnostic' was derived from this very passage. In the year 1869 Thomas Huxley, seeking for a word to express an attitude to religion that was neither believing nor disbelieving hit upon this word in the Book of the Acts: *Agnosto Theo*; and coined the English word 'agnostic' to express a point of view that was becoming increasingly popular among the educated classes of his day.

It was not accidental that this word appeared in the late Victorian era. We have to remember that this was a period of tremendous confidence in the power of human progress. The theory of evolution and the prices on the Stock Exchange all pointed in the same direction. Mankind was on the up and up. When you are assured that humanity is on this upward moving staircase you need not be too concerned with the ultimate question of God.

Now all that has changed. The pace and tragedy of the last forty years has obliterated the confidence in inevitable human progress. We are adrift, and no one can predict whether the magnificent achievements of science will lead mankind to a fuller life or to utter destruction. There is no law of progress that can save us if mankind decides to unloose the nuclear weapons on our continents. No matter how helpless we may personally feel we know that the future depends on the decisions that are made by men. And such decisions are taken by those who are actuated by some convictions concerning the nature and destiny of mankind. History is made by the men of faith—Christian, Muhammadan, Fascist, Communist. The undecided, the apathetic, the agnostic are overtaken and swallowed up by events.

This is one reason why men and women of to-day cannot so happily rest in a position of eternal agnosticism. Among the questions that are forced on us by the logic of events is the fundamental one of the meaning of human life. The final question appears in a new and haunting form: God—or no God? If there is a God, and we can know Him, then our decision must be made. This is where we find the answer to the problem of meaning and direction for our lives. This is not, as it was for so many in the Victorian age an academic question to be discussed in an atmosphere of port and cigars. It is a life-or-death question. As in modern war there is ultimately no place for the neutral.

One can imagine someone saying: 'That's all very well if one has faith enough to know there is a God, or the even greater faith that is needed to know there is no God.' But some very clever people seem to assume that there is no God; other equally clever people are fervent believers. How can one know?

Let me say quite clearly that I believe that there is a legitimate place for a truly humble agnosticism in very many matters of religion. There is something arrogant and shocking in the claim made by some religious people to know all about the mind and purposes of God. There are fanatics about who seem to be walking Bradshaws of heaven and hell, knowing every detail of our fate. There is even, I believe, a legitimate period of agnosticism concerning the final question: God or no God. It is not unnatural for a student for instance to pass through such a period. But it is not a question in which we can rest.

The army of absolute unbelievers is relatively small in our country to-day. But there are hosts who are making do with a vague and shadowy belief. They are convinced that there is some kind of power in control of events, and occasionally feel what Wordsworth called

> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man.

They would like to know more, but have not yet been convinced.

It was to such the apostle spoke. 'Whom therefore ye agnostically worship, him declare I unto you.' Such views do represent a kind of worship. Every man or woman who recognizes that this material life is bounded by a mystery; every one who owns some moral standard to which we must conform; every one except those who have deliberately kept within the blinkers of a dogmatic rationalism is in fact a worshipper. To worship is to move out from the narrow grooves of our own bodies and minds and seek a contact with that which is beyond. This is in many ways the prevailing mood of to-day. It is significant that both the grandsons of Thomas Huxley—Aldous and Julian—have written recently often on religious subjects. Aldous Huxley, who wrote when I was a student with the witty, metallic cynicism of the period, has since joined the company of those who see the religious question as the most important of all. Julian Huxley, still writing as a scientific humanist and commending it as an ersatz religion to this generation, has spoken of what he calls the 'God-shaped blank' in the modern mind. This is a good description of agnostics. They are by nature worshippers—not materialists or cynics—but at the centre there is a 'God-shaped blank'—a blank because they cannot say what or who it is that they worship; and 'God-shaped' because, as some would say, the centuries of Christian tradition have left their imprint on our minds, and, as I would rather say with St. Augustine long ago, 'God has made us for Himself and our hearts are restless till they find their rest in Him.'

The Christian gospel is addressed not only to the out-and-out unbeliever but also to this agnostic worshipper. The apostle believed that he could bring him the news about God for which consciously or unconsciously he was seeking. The God-shaped blank can be filled. As St. Paul puts it elsewhere: 'God hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.' This is still the Christian affirmation.

The heart of the gospel is a declaration that 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' There are words there that need explanation, ideas that can be discussed; but the gist of it is a declaration that in the centre of history the living God has come to us in Jesus Christ who lived here for us, died here for us, rose again for us, and can live in us when we believe.

'Whom therefore ye agnostically worship . . .' We can only be legitimately agnostic up to the moment when God speaks to us. And we are not genuine agnostics unless we are open to be spoken to by God. There are some agnostics who are subconsciously afraid of the revolution that Christ can bring when they are born into His kingdom. Discussion and argument may clear the air, just as the air was cleared in that discussion long ago on the roof-top in Jerusalem when the stars looked down on Jesus and Nicodemus. And then as they listened to the wind sighing over the city, an invisible power blowing away the dust, the words were spoken: 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

How long have you been worshipping at the altar of the unknown God? Has the time not come to make a decision? 'Whom therefore ye agnostically worship—the God whom you dimly sense, the Christ whose ways you deeply respect—Him declare I unto you.' Jesus Christ the revealer of God, crucified for you, risen for you, the Lord of Life—your life. To be brought face to face with Him is like Thomas to be done with agnosticism and to worship 'My lord and my God.'

Recent Foreign Theology

The Language of Jesus. The view that Jesus normally spoke Aramaic has become so established that it will cause some surprise that Professor H. Birkeland, of Oslo, has challenged it in a short study that seeks to show that Hebrew was His normal language.[1] It is maintained that Hebrew continued to be the language of the lower classes down to the Christian era, and this Biblical Hebrew and not Mishnaic. The upper classes are held to have been Aramaic speaking, while only the learned understood both. The need for Aramaic Targums of the Scriptures is held to have been the need of the illiterate upper classes, so that the earliest Targums were made for their benefit. A strong argument for the current view has always been seen in the Aramaic words found on the lips of Jesus in the New Testament, such as *Talitha cumi*. Here, however, Birkeland argues that, if Jesus habitually spoke Aramaic, we should have expected these words to be translated into Greek, like His

[1] *The Language of Jesus* [1954]. Jacob Dybwad, Oslo; Kr. 4.50.

other sayings. He therefore holds that these words must have been exceptionally spoken in Aramaic, and so were left in that language. It is doubtful if the established view will yield lightly to the new attack.

Communion with God in the Psalms. A Dutch dissertation, written in English, is devoted to the mystical communion with God in the Psalter.[1] The author introduces his study by a review of the opinions of modern scholars on magic and mysticism in the Old Testament. He himself recognizes magical ideas there, but it is a little disconcerting to find that his definition of magic includes the idea that leprosy is due to the act of God and the New Testament belief in demon possession. There is a discussion of the meaning of a number of terms which are found in the Old Testament to indicate aspects of the experience of Divine fellowship, and a study of seven psalms. These are 16, 18, 25, 27, 31, 36, 63. In these a measure of mysticism is found. The trouble with the word 'mysticism' is the variety of meaning it carries. There is no mysticism in the Old Testament in the sense of absorption into the deity. Prophets and others sometimes felt that they were so penetrated by the spirit of God that they were, in Professor Johnson's phrase, 'extensions of His personality.' Yet they were always conscious that they were other than God. In the present dissertation it is emphasized that such mysticism as is here examined reflects a growing monotheism. It is always the God before whom men bow in awe who of His grace privileges them to share His fellowship, and the mysticism lies simply in that it has no corporeal basis. Its difference from much Oriental mysticism is not to be forgotten.

The Social Teaching of the Old Testament. Another Dutch dissertation, on a somewhat larger scale and written in French, is devoted to the study of the poor in Israel, and the development of a social sense.[2] Again we have, first of all, a study of terms, and all the words used for the poor are carefully examined. This is followed by a survey of the legislation designed to protect the poor from exploitation, and all the teaching we find elsewhere in the Old Testament, either in the form of denunciation of exploitation or of positive teaching, which concerns itself with the depressed classes. The frequent association of the poor with the pious leads to a long chapter on this. That this does not justify any complacency towards poverty is clear from all the concern to alleviate the lot of the poor. Moreover, we find frequent commendations of the poor to charity, since poverty is not all due to exploitation, and even where it is the social sense of others besides the exploiters needs to be awakened to supply their need. There is therefore a chapter on this side of Biblical teaching. Other chapters deal with the social background of the Wisdom Literature and the poor in the Messianic age. There have been many other studies of the poor in Israel, so that this thesis does not break new ground. The author has read widely, and gives a rich bibliography, which shows his acquaintance with the work of his predecessors. The merit of his work lies in the fullness and care with which it surveys the material.

Dutch Catholic Commentary on Ezekiel. The sixth part of a major series of commentaries being issued under Dutch Catholic auspices has now appeared. The latest volume is by one of the general editors of the series and is on the Book of Ezekiel,[3] which has been so much discussed and which has given rise to so great a variety of theories in the last decades. Father van den Born published an earlier study[4] under the influence of Bertholet's view, but he has abandoned the view there advanced, and now favours the view that the Book is a pseudepigraph, coming from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. He had already issued an article which prepared us for this change.[5] He thinks the Book was edited by an author in the time of Alexander the Great, who composed ch. 38f. The view that the Book of Ezekiel is a pseudepigraph is not new, and it has long been championed by Torrey, who, however, puts it later than does van den Born. The view that it is a pseudepigraph coming from the time of Alexander was put forward recently by L. E. Browne,[6] but van den Born does not mention his work in his bibliography. The Commentary contains a new translation of the text—the list of emendations adopted is indicated in a list at the end of the book—and there is a full and well-informed commentary beneath the translation. The value of the detailed commentary does not depend on the acceptance of the major theory, which to the reviewer does not seem likely.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University.

[1] H. J. Franken, *The Mystical Communion with YHWH in the Book of Psalms* [1954]. Brill, Leiden; Fl. 8.

[2] C. van Leeuwen, *Le Développement du sens social en Israël* [1954]. Van Gorcum, Assen.

[3] A. van den Born, *Ezechiël* (*De Boeken van het Oude Testament*, XI. Bk 1) [1954]. Romen and Zonen, Roermond; Fl. 10.80.

[4] *De historische situatie van Ezechiels prophetie* [1947]. Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lx. [July, 1949], 289.

[5] 'Ezechiël—Pseudo-epigraaf?' in *Studia Catholica*, [April, 1953], pp. 94 ff.

[6] *Ezekiel and Alexander* [1952]. See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxiv. [April 1953], 202 f.

Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic[1]—I

By Professor H. Thielicke, D.D., University of Hamburg

Translated from the German by the Reverend John Macquarrie, B.D., Ph.D., Glasgow

Bultmann's work can be understood only against the background of recent theological development.

Before the historical problems had been settled, the findings of historical criticism were, so to speak, put into storage and explained to be irrelevant to theology, by means of the battle-cry, 'pneumatic exegesis,' and the dialectic theology. By this means they were deprived of theological control. And now a host of unsettled arguments has, as it were, gathered together like a partisan army of hostile and destructive thoughts in the rear of the theological front. That has all happened quite naturally, and indeed it had to happen thus. Any one who saw beneath the surface must have been awaiting for a long time a tremendous historical-critical repercussion.

For this partisan army Bultmann has, among other things (such as an extraordinarily strong contribution of material), set up the banner on which the party colours, 'demythologizing,' gleam in letters of fire and brimstone. But this army would still be there even without that flag—though it must be confessed that flags and catchwords possess a very strong mobilizing power. In this sense I refer the dynamic of the whole movement not solely but yet in a considerable degree to this magic-laden catchword.

Moreover, Bultmann has been saying exactly the same things for decades. He has preserved a thoroughly rigid continuity of thought and even of terminology. If Bultmann had not found this catchword, his whole enterprise might possibly have remained fairly 'academic.' What would have provided him even then with a certain commanding influence within the university would have been nothing but the magical simplicity of his method, and his idea of the hermeneutic principle which is its ultimate consequence. By means of this he has made philological, literary-historical and theological problems accessible to an all-embracing grasp, and this must forcibly impress intelligent young people. When faced with the complexity of New Testament exegetical problems, of which it is so difficult to obtain a general view, Bultmann's principle offers them an alleviation of their difficulties, and the possibility of obtaining just such a general view, and this is something that is not without its fascination. Besides, there is offered a synthesis of exegetical research and systematic problems such as our New Testament scholars in general fail to provide.

To-day I would like to make a few critical observations on Bultmann's hermeneutic programme.

I begin with a thesis advanced by Bultmann in a discussion in which he was chiefly concerned with Schleiermacher and Dilthey: 'An understanding, and interpretation, is . . . always oriented to a definite way of putting the question, it has a definite direction' (*ThK* [1950], 51).[2] I understand Isaiah when I ask him about that which determines his thought. I do not understand him if I ask about his psychology or make use of him as a source for the religious and cultural history of Israel. Admittedly I can do that also, and even must do it. But if I am a historian of culture, for instance, and make use of him for that purpose, *i.e.*, if I make use of him as source-material for ends determined by me as the goal of my inquiry, I do not advance the claim to 'understand' Isaiah. In that case I would resemble the wardrobe-mistress of a theatre who has to provide the costumes for Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe*, and who establishes from pictures of the time of Frederick the Great how an officer's uniform looked at that time, and how the ladies of the rococo period were dressed. And why should the wardrobe-mistress not make use of material concerning Old Fritz gained from histories and pictures, why should she not make use of Frederick the Great himself, as a source for her very honourable line of business? But—unlike too many historians who have a blind spot here—she will scarcely put forward the claim that as a result of her inquiry unto uniforms, she now herself stands in such a relation to Frederick the Great that she can divine his character, and thus illuminate it.

No: real understanding is gained only in an inquiry which is properly oriented. In any case, that holds quite definitely for kerygmatic texts in which the author knows himself to be committed. If for me the theme on which the Apostle Paul writes—if for me guilt and justification are of no

[1] *Erwägungen zu Bultmanns Hermeneutik*: a Paper read by Professor Thielicke in Glasgow, June 1955.

[2] The paper quoted here is now available in an English translation, entitled 'The Problem of Hermeneutics.' See *Essays, Philosophical and Theological*, R. Bultmann, [1955] 234–261.

importance, then I do not lay claim to the *key* to his existence, and I do not *understand* him concerning these things, even if I were a brilliant New Testament philologist and had the most masterly command of Hellenistic and late Jewish religious history. For Paul *exists* under this theme. This existence has a theme. Any one who interprets Paul only from a psychiatric point of view misses this theme. He explains what Paul is as regards his psychological constitution, while this psychological constitution is itself determined by the concrete subject-matter of the Pauline proclamation. Similar hermeneutic misconceptions occur if perchance an unbelieving psychiatrist treats a Christian for 'religious complexes.' If he treats him without regard to the theme of faith to which this Christian is related, then the psychiatrist is not in a position to distinguish in his patient between that which is genuinely determined by his faith and that which belongs to the province of pathology. A psychiatrist of this kind would have to understand absolutely *everything* which the Christian patient believes, and which he knows perhaps about the consciousness of guilt, as a rank pathological growth of the *psyche*. Thus what he lacks for a real grasp of this man and of the picture of his illness is the relation to the theme of faith, which determines the existence of this Christian, and which is lacking to him in the zones of his personality affected by his illness. What is really happening in him is at once a laying hold and a failure to lay hold on the theme of faith. To comprehend that constitutes the true understanding of the matter, and not the bare taking cognizance of historical and psychological connexions.

But as much as we must acknowledge Bultmann to be right as over against the historical and psychological front, so we must now regard as problematical the positive part of his hermeneutic thesis. This is what he says: If the understanding is always oriented to a certain direction, then that implies that 'the interpretation is never without its presuppositions; or to speak more exactly, that it is always guided by a pre-understanding [1] of the matter, and *in conformity with* this pre-understanding the text is examined. It is only on the basis of such a pre-understanding that a formulation of the question and an interpretation first become possible at all' (*ThK*, 51).

Now what does it mean to have a pre-understanding?

When, having regard to the meaning of this question, I attend to all that Bultmann has written about it, and especially what he says about it in the context of demythologizing, it seems to me that what he intends by this concept of 'pre-understanding' is twofold.

[1] *Vorverständnis.*

(1) What I already know of the kerygmatic theme. For instance, confronted with the Pauline teaching about sin, I always bring to it a pre-understanding that is already there, in so far as I know what good and evil mean in a moral sense, and also know about my own accusing conscience. The totality of that which the natural man thus contributes as a pre-understanding, Bultmann sees —especially in his earlier writings—as representatively brought together and exhibited in Heidegger. Because I possess this pre-understanding, the Pauline themes in general can ring a bell for me, and I can find a place for them within my field of view. Otherwise they would be like Chinese music for me. This pre-understanding, such as, for example, philosophy possesses when it knows of the guilt of mankind, is then itself corrected in confrontation with the *kerygma* and is formed into an *understanding*. Here we find active in him a considerable element of humanist, historical, and psychological tradition which can without difficulty be referred from the biographical point of view back to his teacher.

(2) While *this* concept of the pre-understanding in Bultmann is universally acknowledged and often enough made mention of, there is another content of thought implied in this concept which does not appear so clearly in general discussion. It is also much more obscure, but in its consequences even more influential for Bultmann's theology.

This other side of the concept of pre-understanding consists in the following: The pre-understanding is always related to a definite way in which man estimates himself; he estimates himself, for example, as one who is lost, *i.e.*, one who is fallen away from his authenticity. It is by no means only theology, but also philosophy which knows about man's lost condition, his 'not-being-in-order,' even as natural man. 'That he has lost himself or gone astray . . . is something which philosophy also assumes'; in this sense 'Heidegger's philosophy calls man out of his lost condition in *das Man* back to himself.' (*K.u.M.*, 37). Further, man knows about his finitude, he knows about himself as some one who is projected on to death. He also knows about himself as one who is given over to anxiety, and for whom 'being-in-the-world' is uncanny. Thus the pre-understanding is a kind of self-understanding. And self-understanding means, for its part, a kind and a way of self-evaluation.

What *rôle* is played by this self-understanding, when it is confronted with the revelation, the *kerygma*? That can be quite simply expressed: it is *transvalued*. Man, who in the natural way must understand himself as one who is given over to finitude and to judgment, now comes to know in dying and rising with Christ that he receives a

new future; he may now estimate himself as one ordained to life. Consequently he obtains *another* self-understanding.

Here we perceive that the natural self-understanding is ready to allow itself to be transvalued only in a way that is completely *conditioned*, namely, it inquires of the *kerygma* in conformity with *that which is already contained in itself in its urge towards transvaluation*. Only in that is man interested. What does not concern his self-understanding, and what is therefore not capable of being interpreted in anthropological terms, is for man not actual. There are conditions laid down, determined from the first and which must be fulfilled, in order that a sentence or a report of the New Testament can be qualified as an obligatory part of the *kerygma*. 'The understanding of reports about events as the activity of God presupposes a pre-understanding of what in general an activity of God *can* mean' (*ThK*, 66). This activity cannot, for example, be exhibited in objective occurrences. But in that case the historical [1] character of the *kerygma*, for example, the historic facticity [2] of Cross and Resurrection, is for self-understanding '*relatively*' beside the point and unimportant. All that is now of necessity banished to the region of an illegitimate objectivizing of God, and thus to a region of miracle and myth. For in order that my self-understanding may be transformed, I do not actually require the facticity of those saving events. Such a transvaluation could be accomplished by some other gospel, it could be accomplished by Plato.

Admittedly Bultmann differentiates more exactly here. He would not like just to *relinquish* history as such. But the normative power of the pre-understanding, being a law unto itself, does not permit him any more than a very attenuated history, which really does not go beyond the historic character of a figure like Plato. Thus the resurrection of Christ is no historical fact, which took place in the external world, but is the visionary reflex in the *psyche* of the disciples, derived from their encounter with one who had sojourned on earth.

Incidentally Bultmann has tried to explain in connexion with the image of a dream that this visionary reflex does not mean that therefore the resurrection of Christ is to be denoted as unhistoric and referred merely to the inner psychical regions of the disciples. This is what he says: 'If I dream of my friend, then admittedly the dream-representation which I have in that moment is not the image of a real situation. But I produce the dream of my friend only because I have in reality met him. The dream comments, as it were, on a real meeting which has actually occurred. In a similar fashion the resurrection-dream of the disciples is also a reaction to what they experienced with Jesus Christ. The resurrection-vision interprets the figure of Jesus as some one who is superior to death.'

In other words: The pre-understanding is not simply 'pre' in a temporal sense, as something which I am already bringing to the *kerygma*, but it has in addition a concrete *postulatory* power, and has its effect on the content of that which is to be recognized as legitimate *kerygma* at all. It works like a sieve, through which the kerygmatic contents are filtered. Through this sieve there passes only that which has a valid claim to truth, namely, that which can become the content of a self-understanding. *For Bultmann, what happens is not history, but only consciousness.* Thus the pre-understanding gains for itself the rank of a criterion and norm, at least, of a criterion which works secretly and, as it were, not objectively. On that account Bultmann is theologically not very much interested whether a New Testament *datum*, whether Christmas, Easter or Whitsunday are historic facts or whether they are myths—or, like the report of the Resurrection, commentaries upon facts, put together in mythological categories. For the ideal content of a historical event *and* the ideal content of a myth can influence the understanding of my existence *in the same way*. On that account I lose nothing as a Christian if I refer to the rubric of myth everything in which God becomes objective, in which He is in the content of the world and what occurs in the world. For by this procedure that report is by no means eliminated. Rather it is *exactly so* that it can become fruitful for existence, as an interpreted report, *i.e.*, as a report in which we attend to the ideal content.

At this point we must make our decisive reservation against Bultmann's hermeneutic principles. The principle of the pre-understanding is a normative principle foreign to the Bible, which works as a criterion brought in from outside. To express it very pointedly: If I accept this pre-understanding, I can no longer regard everything as possible. The historical facticity of the gospel *data* is from this point immediately rendered incapable of being discussed, because these *data* go far beyond the capacity for existential treatment, and they just could not go into my self-understanding.

[1] The distinction between *geschichtlich* and *historisch* has been preserved in the translation by the device of using 'historical' for the former and 'historic' for the latter. But Professor Thielicke assures me that in his thought this distinction has little importance, and certainly nothing like the significance which attaches to it in Bultmann.

[2] *Faktizität*. Professor Thielicke uses this term in the sense of 'factual character,' and it would be misleading to read into it here the philosophical connotations which it carries in Bultmann.

Here we see the limit of Bultmann's thesis, that I must examine a text with regard to its orientation. He is always assuming that this orientation is an existential theme of my self-understanding. Although he understands the *kerygma* as a decisive question, Bultmann does not reckon seriously with the possibility that the Biblical text examines *me*; or, better expressed, that it throws all my orderly formulations of the question on to the dust-heap, and teaches me the right question (the counter-question of Jesus in the New Testament). He does not reckon seriously with the possibility that as regards the *kerygma* much more happens in *heaven* than in my mind, which forms the self-understanding. And further he does not reckon that much more important than my dying and rising with Christ is the fact that Christ died and rose again *de facto* and quite independently of me, and that therefore the history of the saving events in the years 1 to 30, or in other words—and here every word is exactly weighed and carefully formulated—that facticity *extra me* possesses the ontical primacy as over against the consequence modelled upon it of a dying and rising with Christ in me.

Thus Bultmann does not confront the *kerygma* without reservation, but by his pre-understanding he prejudges what that can be which may legitimately be entitled *kerygma*.

This prejudicial element consists of the question, whether and how far a text is capable of being interpreted existentially, *i.e.*, whether and how far it can become the content of a possible self-understanding.

Here, indeed, lies a real problem, which I can only point out.

I cannot indeed get away from this examination of the text, because otherwise I renounce every hermeneutic criterion and am then in danger of being given over to a rigid doctrine of verbal inspiration. Such a doctrine would compel me to accept everything in a lump as *verbum Dei*, as *kerygma*, for no other reason than that it 'stands there.' How, for example, am I to get through the esoteric jungle of the Apocalypse without such critical hermeneutic principles? In the esoteric fantasies of the sects we see whither the neglect of such principles leads. Thus it is indeed necessary to have certain critical principles of understanding. Our question to Bultmann is only to this effect: how far has he gathered these principles from the text itself? How far, for example, has he seriously taken that of self-understanding as belonging to a *historical* report? (This question arises especially as regards the way in which Bultmann designates the miracle-stories of the New Testament as not relevant for theology.) Or again, how far has he brought in those principles from outside by a roundabout route through the pre-understanding and the modern world-picture? Is it, for example, through a standard of valuation contained in this understanding that he becomes indifferent whether certain contents of the *kerygma*, such as Cross and Resurrection, have a real or a mythical character? In a thinker of the rank of Bultmann, who has himself thoroughly pondered every one of his theses, this question can be the subject of endless discussions. And even if I were to establish my antithesis in further detail than I am able to do here, there would never emerge a univocal finding. In all serious theological controversy a point is usually reached when there is nothing left but to say: the tendency of your thoughts seems to me to be moving univocally in the direction of this goal or that goal (in Bultmann, towards dehistoricizing, in Catholicism, to mention another example, to an understanding of grace as a quality of man). I will not be dissuaded from my goal by the wealth of arguments with the help of which you have secured the rear and the flanks of this way which you have built up. Any one who has a little experience in such controversies will confirm me in this. Every encounter which is intellectual only and is carried on by question and answer is always unending and leads to no decision—to a colon rather than a full stop. Further, that is one of the reasons which explains why ecclesiastical decisions concerning doctrine never appear in the framework of a theological discussion, but have the form of a 'confession' or a 'condemnation.' It is true that they themselves make use of theological argument, and in their turn provoke theological controversy, but they are themselves in no way the *product* of a theological disputation.

Bultmann examines the text, but he does not let himself be examined in turn by this text as regards his own basic positions, for example, on the basic positions of the so-called 'modern world-picture' which ever and again becomes visible as the soul of demythologizing. He is concerned with the seamless join between revelation and natural understanding. If I am right, there appears in this the final mystery of Bultmann's theology, or rather its final embarrassment: namely, that it possesses no teaching on the Holy Spirit. Only where this doctrine is properly worked out does it become necessary to move nearer to the thought that the Word does not ring a bell in a pre-understanding that is already given, but that the Word in which the Spirit works produces its own hearer, and that thus a new creation takes place.

Only while I let myself both question and be put in question by the text do I take the historical object seriously, otherwise I am in danger of taking only myself and the presuppositions of my thought seriously. And Bultmann takes the presuppositions of his thought, the principles of the nineteenth century, in deadly earnest. [*To be continued.*

Religious Education

Some Impressions of Religious Education in Western Germany

By Joan Hazelden Walker, B.D., Ph.D., Whitelands College, London

In January 1955 a party of twenty British educationists from the Ministry of Education, University Departments of Education and Teacher Training Colleges were invited by the West-German Government to spend some three-and-a-half weeks studying post-war German education. The first week was spent at Schloss Schwöbber, near Hameln, the former home of the counts of Münchhaussen and now a Teachers' Conference Centre for Lower Saxony. Here we were entertained by prominent German educationists, improving not only our scanty knowledge of German education but also our familiarity with the harpsichord and the works of John Sebastian Bach. From Schwöbber we were sent 'two by two' to various colleges in the Federal Republic. Previous intimation of our personal interests had been given; thus, as a lecturer in theology, I was sent to Göttingen and Wuppertal, where theological studies play an important rôle in the training of teachers.

A few basic facts must necessarily preface any personal impressions on religious education in post-war Germany.[1] Until about 1880, all schools were confessional, that is, schools in which children of one religious creed are instructed together by teachers of the same creed. Thus children were segregated into Protestant and Roman Catholic schools. Segregation in this sense was unnecessary in those parts of Germany where the population was homogeneous in church affiliation, as, for example, in Southern Bavaria (Roman Catholic) and Schleswig-Holstein (Lutheran). It made itself felt, however, in areas of mixed population and, of course, in the large cities.

With the so-called 'Enlightenment' and a growing religious tolerance in the late nineteenth century, inter-confessional schools were established. Here the children are only segregated for religious instruction. In certain areas non-confessional schools were established giving no religious teaching. In predominantly Jewish areas, Jewish schools were provided. The Nazis abolished segregation of the children by creed and in 1945, after the war, the Occupying Powers, although rescinding many of the Nazi measures, ordered that schools should be opened as inter-confessional. Now the Federal Republic requires that religion is taught in all schools; in other words, all schools are Christian, unless they are established as non-confessional. Within the Federal Republic the states have varied considerably in their policy. Some make no mention of this aspect of education; others stipulate that schools must be non-confessional; others stress the confessional character but make provision for inter-confessional public elementary schools, if the parents so desire them. The matter has become a hotly debated issue in German politics. The Lutheran Church is not opposed to inter-confessional schools provided that children are instructed in the tenets of its faith. The Roman Catholic Church, however, demands confessional schools as a matter of principle. The problem affects the elementary school exclusively. Practically all public secondary schools are inter-confessional. So are institutions of higher learning, except for theological schools and teacher training colleges in those states where confessional elementary schools are the rule.

In all inter-confessional schools the rights of parents, teachers, and children are safeguarded. Parents may withdraw their children from religious instruction; teachers are not forced to give religious instruction to which they are opposed; children over the age of fourteen may choose to absent themselves irrespective of their parents' wishes. The content of the teaching must be in accordance with the tenets of the Churches concerned. In this way they are given the power to influence the selection of teachers and the approval of their appointment. It is not difficult to understand why, in these circumstances, Germany has no agreed syllabus so familiar in this country.

Personal impressions of a university, a theological school, two teacher training colleges, and various types of schools in two brief but overcrowded weeks can only give a very superficial picture of religious education in Western Germany. They all seem to have set a phenomenally high standard of learning. Göttingen University is world famous, especially for its theological faculty. A lecture on Alexander of Hales was attended by

[1] See E. J. Hylia and F. O. Kegel, *Education in Germany: An Introduction to Foreigners* [Frankfurt a. Main, 1954], 41 ff.

about two hundred students. I was particularly interested in the large number of women studying theology both here and at the Theological School of Wuppertal. Those with whom I spoke on the subject confirmed that it is general. A number are training for the ministry in some of the Protestant Churches.

The *Pädagogische Hochschule* at Göttingen, which is intimately connected with the University, has a theologian for its Director. This fact is eloquent enough. Here the Lutheran students are offered courses in the problems and methods of present-day biblical exegesis, philosophical anthropology, Reformation history, and a detailed study of the work of one of Göttingen's theologians—Friedrich Gogarten. The Roman Catholics are given courses in biblical studies and systematic theology. One lecture a week is allocated by both to religious education. At the *Pädagogische Akademie*, Wuppertal, the Rector is again a theologian of repute. The courses here are of a similar nature. This College caters only for Lutheran students. Due to the large percentage of Roman Catholics in the state of North-Rhine-Westphalia, the Catholics have their own training college in the neighbourhood of Wuppertal.

The lectures in the basic course in religious education, *i.e.* those which are attended by all students, struck me as similar to those given in our own training colleges, but the seminars with those students specialising in theology are of the standard of our universities and theological schools. It was stimulating to enter into lively discussion on modern theological trends and to find training college students expounding Professor Bultmann as if they were studying a first reading primer! It is evident that, in the milieu of German training colleges, books are really read and discussed. Lecturers, therefore, have to be abreast with the progress of study. It is dangerous to generalize from two colleges; but, if elsewhere the standards of teaching and learning are only half as good, both lecturers and students in this country have much to learn.

The pursuit of learning is not the whole aspect of religious education. The art of teaching, *i.e.* principles of education, must also be applied. I saw little evidence of attempts to tackle this problem along the lines followed in our own training colleges. The dearth of visual aid material and suitable literature was apparent not only in the colleges but also in the schools. This deficiency is not surprising because such aids are scarce in most subjects. The events of the past two decades are partly to blame, but, on the whole, teaching methods are more formal than ours. Religious education inevitably will be the last to be influenced by a more modern approach; our own experience is well known. Thus, in Germany, the verse-by-verse Bible reading and exegesis, though undoubtedly learned, appears dull in contrast to the Scripture lessons given by teachers of equal calibre here. One wonders what the older children in the *Volksschule* might achieve if offered some of the exciting projects detailed by Mr. Bernard Youngman.[1]

The majority of school children, both Catholic and Lutheran, receive extensive instruction from their clergy. The Lutherans, for example, spend two years in preparing them for confirmation. The attendance of the children is almost a matter of course. The Catholic clergy are equally zealous for their young parishioners. From the close partnership of clergy and teachers much can be learned here. First, in our zeal for religious tolerance, for non-interference of the clergy and an agreed syllabus, a very large proportion of young people slips through our hands. The real need for a basic but thorough Christian education, so much felt in adult life, is sacrificed to a profession of principles in which charity becomes the enemy of charity. A second paradox seems to present itself. In our schools we give such an important place to school worship. Real efforts are made to make the school assembly into an act of corporate worship rather than a convention for notices and news. In Germany the religious assembly is not a feature of school life. But in Britain, constant laments are heard that our young people do not go to church, whereas in Germany the churches are full. If ordinary daily life provides some indication of what is going on in Germany, surely there must be a connexion between crowded churches and co-operation of Church and School. If ordinary daily life provides some indication of what is going on here, then surely a remedy suggests itself: school worship cannot be isolated or divorced from public worship, or religious education from Christian creeds.

[1] *Teaching Religious Knowledge* [London, 1953].

Entre Nous

The Local Background of the Gospels

It always makes the very greatest difference to know the background against which any event happened. And that is particularly true of the events of the gospel story. For that reason books which tell us of the background of life in Palestine are always interesting, and when they are written out of first-hand and expert knowledge they become of first-rate importance. Such a book is *Jesus of Palestine : The Local Background to the Gospel Documents*, by the Rev. Eric F. F. Bishop (Lutterworth Press ; 30s. net). Before Mr. Bishop became Lecturer in Arabic in Glasgow University he was for twenty-five years engaged in missionary service in Palestine, and he calls his book 'notes of twentieth-century parallels in thought, speech and action to first-century life in Palestine, as it is depicted to us in the gospel documents'. Mr. Bishop goes consecutively through the gospel narrative citing such parallels as he goes.

In a book like this we can only dip at random, and every time we emerge with treasure-trove. Mk 1^{13} speaks of Jesus being alone with the wild beasts in the wilderness during His temptation. 'The root of the word used for wild animals in Arabic—*wuhūsh*—carries the implication both of desolation, loneliness and the withdrawal from human society. To-day, when a friend returns after a long absence, the greeting is heard—*awashtana*—you have made us feel like wild animals for loneliness'.

On the Parable of the Two Builders (Mt 7^{24-27}) Mr. Bishop cites an illustration from his own experience. 'When the C.M.S. hospital was being built in Salt before the War, on a site intended for many years, the local church committee deplored the lack of proper foundations. . . . They were right, for the foundations were undermined by the rainfall on the hill behind seeping through and causing tell-tale cracks on important walls. . . . Repairs have cost more than the hospital.'

Jesus invited men to take His yoke upon them and to learn of Him (Mt 11^{29-30}). 'The Palestinian yoke is always meant for two.' When a young ox is broken in, it is always yoked beside 'an older one, accustomed to the work', and thus the younger one learns to bear the yoke.

Many of the strong vivid terms of the gospel will be illuminated if we remember that in Eastern language 'There are no middle terms between "doing good" and "doing evil," between "saving a life" and destroying it.' 'There is no middle term between black and white. Grey is not reckoned as a colour.' 'The Semite and the Arab particularly has no word for "compromise" in his vocabulary.'

There is one very interesting note on the way in which salt might be cast out and trodden underfoot of men. 'Miss F. E. Newton suggests that the reference is to ovens built of stone and tiles. In these "in order to retain the heat a thick bed of salt is laid under the tiled floor. After a certain length of time the salt perishes. The tiles are taken up, the salt removed and thrown into the road outside the door of the oven. . . . It has lost its power to heat the tiles, so it has been thrown out."'

Mr. Bishop quotes a modern instance to illustrate the Parable of the Guest without the Garment. 'When some members of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry visited the King of Sa'ūdi Arabia in 1946, they were presented among other things with Arab dress ; which in any case it would have been courteous to wear, though unlikely that westerners might possess.'

Mr. Bishop quotes an experience of Dr. John Van Ess in illustration of the picture of the shepherd and the sheep. 'One day towards sunset I rode up to a large enclosure made of mud walls, perhaps six feet high, on the top of which thorns had been placed. In front was a door way but no door, and inside were scores of sheep. So I asked the shepherd standing there what was the use of all the precautions of walls and thorns since there was no door. "Oh," he said, "I sleep in the doorway. *I am the door.* Ya Abdur Rahman," he shouted, "open up a stall for the guest and his horse." And to him and for me *the porter opened.*'

There is not a page in this fascinating book which does not help the New Testament to come alive.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.